LATE NINETEENTH CENTURY EDUCATIONAL CHANGE IN ENGLAND AND WALES:

AN ORGANISATIONAL APPROACH

Allan R Hodge

Thesis submitted for the M.Phil. degree of the University of London (Institute of Education).

January 1989

Abstract

This study of change in educational policy-making in the late 19th century draws on two disciplines for its inspiration: that of historical research, and that of the branch of sociology termed organisation theory. More precisely, it owes its structure to the application of organisation theory to historical research. As such, its preoccupations are not so much with individual characters, or with their contributions as free-standing agents, but rather with the group (specifically, the organisation), with individuals as representative of the group, and with group action and reaction to the broader sweep of policy. The theme is that the study of public policy-making in the modern, or near-modern, corporate state is essentially the study of organisational interaction. Traditional historical research recognises the importance of organised interests, but lacks the tools adequately to interpret their interaction. This work attempts to make a bridge from the new perspective on the recent past which organisation theory can provide, and so provide a methodological synthesis.

The issues depicted concern the series of linked events in the process of change in public policy-making in education in England and Wales between 1894 and 1902. This period, although quite short, has a relative completeness of antecedents and conclusions, insofar as this can be said of any historical period, which lends itself well to the analysis noted above. Chapter 1 acts as an

Introduction and outlines the methodology, and hypotheses to be tested. Chapter 2 examines the contemporary forms of ideology, curriculum and organisation through analysis of the Bryce Report of 1895. Chapter 3 sets out the main themes and insights of organisation theory as applied to the public sector, with particular reference and illustration in the period. Chapter 4 is based on the application of organisation theory to research material on events surrounding the Board of Education Act 1899: it draws new interpretations from familiar sources. Chapter 5 sets out the conclusions to the work.

CONTENTS

Tables

Chapter 1

Approaching the study of educational change: an Introduction

This study concerns change in the organisation of secondary education in England and Wales at the end of the last century. A major emphasis of this work will be that all educational change is political in nature, and that organisational and curriculum changes are no exception to this rule. Moreover, political change is not just *one* aspect of the national curriculum change process - the latter is *essentially* political change, and this for the following reasons. Politics is the study of power relationships between people, of control, influence or persuasion on the one hand, and of compliance or obstruction on the other. Organisational and curriculum changes are political because they involve power shifts between those who provide the changes or are in any way responsible for the form that they take, and because they will reflect the providers' view of what is educationally desirable and thus affect the providers' relationships with recipients and also relationships between recipients, the latter because differential curricular provision for different groupings within society will allow those groupings unequal access to positions of power as they move through, and leave, the educational system.

Curriculum is not constructed in a vacuum. However imperfectly, it is constructed by people for a purpose, almost invariably through the medium of organisations which interact with other organisations during the construction process.. To understand the course of

curriculum change, it is necessary to study the dynamics of the interaction between the various groups and individuals that are involved in the change process.[1] Curriculum change is not generally a random or aimless activity - it is purposive, on either a proactive or reactive basis - and in being a deliberate matter that typically takes place, in a pluralistic society, through the activities of groups that put forward alternative approaches, we can utilise the insights provided by organisational analysis in trying to identify the reasons for change. Organisations, by definition, have internal logic in their proceedings and in their structures, and react with other organisations in ways that admit of a certain measure of predictability. Many studies of educational change,[2] in identifying the protagonists in a particular matter, then take too narrow a view in identifying whose contributions were most influential in securing the change, whose views dominated others, and other political questions. These studies are too narrow because such descriptive techniques, while throwing light on the case in hand, do not allow us to make valid generalisations about other situations. This is because such a 'who does what' approach does not draw general conclusions about the behaviour of people in groups, nor put forward hypotheses that could be tested in other circumstances.

The main hypothesis to be tested in this study is that an understanding of national curriculum change proceeds from two interlinked levels of analysis:

1) Determination of the 'facts' of the case in question, as identified by the researcher, and the establishment of conclusions about cause and effect. This is what may be called the 'descriptive' part of the analysis. The choice of material by one researcher will inevitably overlap with, but not coincide with, the choice of other researchers on the same question, for the practical reasons that access to sources will be different, as will be ability to manipulate material, and it is axiomatic that researchers' ideological orientations may predispose them to emphasise certain material, and particularly approaches to material, at the expense of others. The implication is that a 'full understanding' is a relative matter with respect to the descriptive part of the analysis (see Paulston 1976).[3]

2) Categorisation of the relationships between those involved in the change. Only in this way can we hope to gain a deeper understanding of the forces involved in change and make generalisations about other change processes. In particular, we should study the relationships of power and influence between them, especially those relating to organisational matters, since most changes in education proceed through the activities of groups, whether on a co-operative or adversarial basis. The activities of individuals may be important, but their ideas are inevitably given expression through organisations.[4]

The idea put forward is, therefore, that the study of national educational change is the study of organisations. To divorce such study from that of organisation and political process is a mistaken approach, since the possibilities and constraints of the organisational context provide the framework within which curricular and other school-based activities take shape. Indeed, one cannot conceive of a national approach to education which is not predicated on the establishment and interaction of organisations.

The question of the relativity of a 'full understanding' is one that continues to exercise historians. One may approximate to it more and more closely within a given paradigm, even achieving the 'state of the art' at a given time, but to admit that there are different paradigms, and this is notoriously the case in change theory, where exclusivity of base assumptions often makes synthesis of approach impossible, is to concede that general acceptability of analysis across paradigms will not be achieved. For example, no Marxist historian would accept the present study as anything but a partial representation of events unless one were to begin with the assumption that the centre's view of national curriculum reflected the prevailing pattern of economic relationships between classes, and the ruling class's wish to perpetuate its domination. On the broader basis, there are fundamental differences between conflict and equilibrium theorists that are difficult to reconcile because they proceed from distinct and mutually incompatible perceptions of social reality. Moreover, in assuming a particular ideological

orientation, either implicitly or explicitly, before starting work, seems to be putting the cart before the horse and begging the question which should be problematic at the outset. One can not always accept the argument of those who say that they are assuming a particular approach as a hypothesis which will stand or fall on the evidence of the study. It rarely falls, because the assumptions made predispose one to turning up 'facts' that support the assumption. Equilibrium theorists look for consensus in social questions, conflict theorists for adversarial relationships, and a closed, circular system of assumptions, 'proofs', and vindication of assumptions ensues. Of course, system and method are central to historical enquiry, but is it possible to develop a non-ideological paradigm for studying change that can generate genuine hypotheses and serve as the basis for studying that hypothesis in a different context without limiting the field of enquiry? In other words, can we develop a paradigm that minimises the probability that a particular interpretation of events is more likely to be adopted than another solely on the basis of procedural assumptions but which avoids going too far in the opposite direction by adopting the minimalist 'who does what' approach that may be no more than a chronicle of events without explicit predictive power?

The deficiencies of both approaches might be avoided, whilst providing a solid structure for a study of change processes without the restrictive weight of an ideology, by basing our study on a framework of organisation, power and communications. These are central to an understanding of the type of changes that we are

concerned with here. The approach is non-ideological because it assumes no world-view of the operation of society as a whole, and is based only on the observed behaviour of people in groups and their relationships with other groups. Having said that, many of the initial assumptions of organisational analysis are based on the logical possibilities that must exist for relationships between people both within groups and across groups, rather than observations within case studies, and as such take our basic structure further still from an ideological approach which must derive what legitimacy it has from *a posteriori* reasoning. It is not the intention to assert that all change processes are explicable purely in terms of the three factors mentioned above, just that these are fundamentally involved in the change process and that, therefore, change can, and should, be studied through them in a way that reduces the likelihood of predetermination of outcomes. It may, however, be argued that an important question is being begged in assuming that an uncontested theory of organisation exists, for if more than one exists, and those that exist have irreconcilable aspects, we are back with the original problem of bias in choice of methodology. The task is to to show that a theory of organisations does exist that meets the criterion of general acceptability.

With respect to organisations, there are distinct emphases by different writers on certain aspects of their structures and behaviour, but these distinctions are neither fundamental nor mutually exclusive. Hall (1974) offers a composite definition

which neither distorts other writers' ideas nor omits anything of importance:

> An organisation is a collectivity with relatively identifiable boundaries, a normative order, authority ranks, communications systems and membership co-ordinating systems; this collectivity exists on a relatively continuous basis in an environment and engages in activities which are usually related to a goal or set of goals.[8]

In other words, the organisation is purposive (it is formally set up to achieve something) and has structured social relationships (the formal disposition of people within it is designed to promote the desired ends). The definition represents a mid-point on a continuum of definitions, on one end of which is the 'closed-system', tightly drawn, bureaucratic model of Weberian origin, with its clear goals and environmental insulation, and at the other extreme the 'open-system' that emphasises a greater 'structural looseness', the possibility of competing goals (i.e. that the purposive activities are not necessarily uni-directional and continuous) and the modifying influences of environmental factors. It would be unwarranted dogmatism to hold that the characteristics at either extreme hold for all organisations. Some tend to one extreme or the other - all have basic features in common.

An important insight of 'mainstream' organisation theory, and one which is crucially important to us in this study, is that the

'informal' reality of an organisation and its activities may differ radically from 'formal' appearance, and the historian, to the extent that he may rely on the 'formal' in collecting data, because of its very accessibility and 'tangibility', may underplay the 'informal' undercurrents that are so important in determining motivations and actions.

The terms 'formal' and 'informal' are central to an understanding of organisations and their relationships with other organisations. By 'formal' is meant those features which give public expression to the official aims of the organisation, while 'informal' refers to those features of organisations which reflect the private concerns of members and the differing aims and preoccupations of groups and individuals which may, or may not, be in opposition to the 'formal'. Informal aims and associations will occur within the formal, and may reinforce the organisation's public purpose or divert it from it. The importance of the distinction is, firstly, the realisation that the study of public aims and pronouncements alone is to study only the formal and, secondly, that disregard for the informal is seriously to neglect both the determination of the formal and the reasons for success or otherwise of the formal viewpoint, since success or failure is influenced by factors both outside and inside the sponsoring organisation. In terms of the present study, in which the task is to try to determine how and why a particular pattern of organisation and curriculum developed, and changed over time, formal descriptions of events, official pronouncements, statutes, Parliamentary debates, and so on, will be

insufficient. They are the facades of reality, the shadows in Socrates' cave, important in themselves as markers through time, often throwing light on the underlying processes of negotiation, compromise, or imposition, but frequently masking them or laying a false trail. To give a relevant current example, the doctrine of ministerial responsibility in government obliges a minister to defend publicly all provisions of a Bill that he is presenting to Parliament. Anonymity in the Civil Service, and collective Cabinet secrecy, present a barrier that has to be overcome if we are to determine the minister's actual position on each provision of the Bill. For the point is that the minister may defend publicly some aspects of the Bill that he disagreed with privately in Cabinet. All formal statements and public documentary evidence indicate full support by the minister for all the Bill's clauses, while informal processes that do not reach the public sphere may tell quite a different story, and it is precisely here that the fuller picture may be found. Indeed, although the major part of this study will be structured by reference to the interaction of participating organisations, a more personal, phenomenological perspective will not be neglected where it seems important to record the views of important individuals. Dale (1973) defines the main distinctions between the two approaches, which can provide a balancing complementarity to a study:

> The emphasis in phenomenology on returning 'to the things themselves' directs us away from much traditional sociological analysis, for, following that precept, the world must be

> recognised as it is directly experienced by actors, and not as it is mediated through imposed sociological concepts.[6]

The phenomenological approach reminds us that over-reliance on hindsight can distort the reality of the situation as experienced by participants themselves, and can cause us to underplay their actual feelings and motivations.

Within our study, the Committee of the Privy Council on Education, the Education Department and the Science and Art Department (S.A.D.), the School Boards and the L.E.A.s, the Cabinet and the pressure groups, not to mention the schools themselves, are all organisations. In interaction, certain combinations of these at different times have played the major part in determining curriculum. Is it possible to generalise about the behaviour of these organisations to the extent of being able to say that a particular disposition of them in a particular context provides a sufficient reason for the development of outcome X?[7] Or is the link between organisational interaction and outcome a more tenuous one? Common-sense must tell us that organisations operate within a context that is at least party beyond their control. For example, an important factor that affects the provision of curriculum is resource availability. This is partly under organisational control, in the sense that a larger or smaller slice of given national resources can be allocated to curriculum development, but the fact that national resources are given at a particular time provides a restraint which cannot be overcome through

organisational effort except through the stimulation of long-term economic development, itself a task of some complexity that may depend primarily on non-educational organisations (private industry, in particular) whose role in curriculum planning may be confined largely to pressure group activity. On the other hand, other restraints may operate that are susceptible to modification by the curriculum sponsoring organisations although the restraints themselves are not curricular in nature. For example, increased specialisation in the advanced school curriculum over the first two decades of the century is attributable partly to increased competition for scarce university places. The provision of university places was open to influence by the Board of Education, one of the main protagonists in contemporary curriculum debate.

To summarise and expand on the points made in this paragraph:

1) Organisations develop curriculum within a context or environment;
2) Some conditions of the context act as restraints which are not directly susceptible to modification by the organisations involved in curriculum development;
3) Other conditions are susceptible to modification by the organisations, although they may be non-curricular in nature;
4) Different organisations in curriculum development are affected in different ways by the restraints, and have differing abilities to modify the restraints in turn. Moreover, this variable impact of the environment affects

organisations' ability to make independent impact on the curricular question in hand, and this, together with the power and communications links between organisations, provides the framework for our study of curriculum development. In other words, national educational change proceeds through the interaction of organisations, those organisations themselves being influenced in different ways by the environment.

With respect to the relationships between organisations, if this is adversarial in nature the organisation with the formal supremacy (probably statute-based) will have enhanced ability to impose itself on subordinates if there is congruency between its own formal and informal aims and structures, since they will be pulling in the same direction and a 'united front' can be presented. On the other hand, the same organisation could present the same public intention vis-a-vis the second organisation but be less successful because of lack of congruency between formal and formal within itself - i.e. both external and internal opposition exists to thwart formal aims.

The distinctions made between formal and informal in organisations are very much a feature of educational systems, and of curriculum determination in particular, because discussions about procedures are as much value-laden as technical (unlike, for example, in industry, where technical questions predominate), and this can generate strongly divergent views on both inter- and extra-organisational bases which cannot be resolved in favour of the

'central' organisation by decree if 'subordinate' organisations have both formal and informal means to oppose it.[8] If power is the ability to get things done, regardless of whether the subordinate wishes to do it, it appears that this is more likely to succeed under the following conditions:

1) The superior organisation is itself united - i.e. there is congruency between the formal and the informal;

2) The superior organisation has **authority** over the subordinate - i.e. the subordinate recognises the superior's claim to **legitimate** power over it. Several typologies of authority have been developed, and following Weber and Parsons we can summarise them as legal-rational, traditional, charismatic and professional. The many studies that have been done of power relationships within the educational field would lead us to believe that the superior organisation would have most success in imposing its views if it operated from a position of legal-rational and professional authority. This is to be determined.

3) The superior organisation has sufficiently good lines of communication with other organisations for it to ascertain whether or not proposed changes are being implemented. In education, vertical communication between levels is often difficult, because of statutory, conventional or practical factors that deny immediate and constant information on curriculum. It may be remembered that, even within the school, the teaching process is such that even the Head will have incomplete knowledge of the actual curriculum

provision, and again we must contrast the formal appearance of the curriculum with what may actually be taking place. The further we go from the school, the more likely involved organisations are to rely more heavily on the publicly stated curriculum as a basis for thought and action, since knowledge of the informal will necessarily be sparse unless communications are extremely good.

A concept crucial to our understanding of organisations, and their success and failures relative to other organisations, is that of *ideology*. This is particularly the case when we are studying them at a national level. The term was originally used in its strict etymological sense to mean the study or science of ideas, but has been corrupted through the efforts of various political philosophers to its modern meaning of 'a set of closely related beliefs or ideas, or even attitudes, characteristic of a group or community'.[9] In other words, the concept is no longer taken to mean solely the study of ideas but has, rather, become associated with the ideas themselves in a particular context, that of social grouping. The importance of ideology in education is that discussion of it may be held to be illuminative of the relationships which exist between those who would wish to participate in the organisation of schools. In particular, the concept of ideology is central to a discussion of curriculum, since the latter involves, to the extent that it is a planned and purposive activity, the desired selection and presentation of knowledge within schools, and may be held to represent the end-

product of the continuous process of organisational interaction which is brought to bear on it.[19]

Plamenatz (1971) distinguishes two dimensions of ideology, and points out that the term is often used rather loosely within its now generally accepted definition of the ideas characteristic of a particular social group. He considers the 'spread' and the 'comprehensiveness' of an ideology, which are, respectively, 'what sort of people or what proportion of a people or of mankind share it', and the 'proportion of their total ideas and attitudes that it covers'. He also distinguishes between explicit and implicit ideologies, respectively those that come to be representative of a group through discussion, articulation and statement, and those that are not thus treated but are only implied by group behaviour. He labels explicit ideologies 'sophisticated', and implicit ones 'unsophisticated, asserting that a given society may express several sophisticated ideologies, but one common unsophisticated ideology which contains, amongst other things, those ideas that are the basis for mutual understanding between all those social groups contained within a given society - indeed, to label a set of different social groups a 'society' is to imply a shared ideology at this basic level.

However, if 'ideology' were used purely in this descriptive sense, it would neither hold such an eminent position in sociological discourse nor be so important to us in a discussion of curriculum determination. Study of it would centre around empirical evidence

of how particular social groups come to hold and to articulate their characteristic ideas and beliefs. But many writers, following the example of Marxist commentators, see ideology not just as the ideas typical of a group, but in addition as something functional for that group - i.e. that its ideology is a means by which it can maintain or improve its position relative to other groups. In other words, ideology is a vital element in the acquisition, extension and maintenance of power and influence. With this additional perspective, the task of the sociologist becomes not just one of determining the social origins of ideologies, but also one of defining their roles in promoting the interests of the groups of which they are characteristic. This is most important when, as here, the study centres on the relationships of competing organisations within an area, like curriculum, where desired outcomes are so obviously and intimately linked with group interests. Salter and Tapper (1981) go further, in stating that not only is educational change negotiated within an institutional context in which economic, social and bureaucratic pressures prevail, but that an educational ideology must be developed to promote, legitimise and defend the successful version, which would, otherwise, be short-lived. Ideology becomes here not merely functional, but essential, in the struggle for dominance.

The centre had both successes and failures in pursuing its educational aims. An *ad hoc*, somewhat disorganised approach, paralleling the state of the educational structure itself, characterised the situation. We begin our analysis in chapter 2 by

considering the links between organisations, ideologies, environmental factors and curriculum, between the years 1894 and 1902.

Appendix

1) Outline of methodology

a) The first task is to choose an approach which avoids the defects of both the restrictive ideological, and the restricted descriptive, approaches to change.

b) The chosen approach is based on the study of curriculum change through participating organisations, the power and communications links between them, and the environmental impact on them.

c) Attention will be paid particularly to formal and informal distinctions within and between organisations. The structured organisational approach, relying to a great extent on the accumulated evidence and deriving benefit from hindsight, will be balanced by a phenomenological perspective.

2) Hypotheses to be tested

a) An understanding of national educational change depends both on description of events, participants and processes, and categorisation of the relationships between those involved in the change.

b) The determination of educational change follows from the impact of environmental influences on organisations, and the interaction of organisations. It should be possible to generalise about the relative importance of these factors in given situations.

c) In the education field, because of the nature of the participants, the ability of one organisation to have its views prevail over another is a function of:

1) the degree of congruency of formal and informal structures within the bodies concerned;
2) the type and degree of authority wielded;
3) the quality of communications between the bodies.

References

1. See chapter 2 for analysis of interaction throughout the Bryce Commission hearings; chapter 3 for the background in organisation theory; chapter 4 for analysis of the dynamics of the change process between 1899 and 1902.

2. Of relevance to this study would be works such as those by Eaglesham, E.R., for example *The foundations of 20th century education in England*, RKP 1972; 'Planning the Education Bill of 1902', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, Vol 9 1960-1; and 'Implementing the Education Act of 1902', *op. cit.*, May 1961; also Gosden, P.H.J.H., *The development of educational administration in England and Wales*, Blackwell 1966.

3. Paulston, R.G., *Conflicting Theories of Social and Educational Change*, University of Pittsburgh 1976.

4. Of particular interest in this study is the role of the public sector organisation - specifically the government department - and its relationship with other public sector bodies and with its environment generally. See chapter 3, part 4, *Politics and administration: the public sector organisation*, and chapter 4.

5. Hall, R.H., *Organisations: Structures and Processes*, Prentice-Hall 1974.

6. Dale, R., 'Phenomenological Perspectives and the Sociology of the School', in Meighan, R., (ed.), *Sociology and Teaching*, Educational Review Vol. 25, No. 3, June 1973.

7. For further discussion of the theoretical basis of this, see particularly chapter 3, part 3, *Organisations and their environment.*
8. As we see in chapter 4, the Education Department had the official and statutory backing to impose itself on the Science and Art Department (S.A.D.) in the process of reorganisation consequent on the passing of the Board of Education Act 1899. It did not, however, have an entirely free hand, as the S.A.D. leadership took every opportunity to defend itself by a variety of informal and bureaucratic procedures.
9. Plamenatz, John, *Ideology*, Macmillan 1971.
10. The ideological aspects of curriculum change are dealt with in chapter 2, in discussion of the Bryce hearings (see page 39) and of the *Report and Recommendations* (see page 94).
11. Salter, Brian, and Tapper, Ted, *Education, Politics and the State*, Grant McIntyre 1981.

Chapter 2

The Bryce Report and Secondary Education

The first chapter of this work supported the assertion that educational change can only adequately be studied through the activities of the organisations that participate in the change process. Indeed, one may generalise this proposition to include all aspects of innovation, development and reform in public administration. This is, to some extent, to move away from a more traditional approach which emphasises the 'high politics' of a case and follows the activities and contributions of leading personalities. In the account which follows, the particular may be sacrificed to the general, the detailed analysis of individuals to the broader sweep of commonly-held ideas. To the extent that the individual is neglected, this is deliberately an attempt to lay stress on the whole. Participants are allowed to speak for themselves, sometimes without comment - at other times, explanatory observations are made as the occasion demands. What is attempted here is transmission of the 'mood' and dominant themes of the Bryce hearings and deliberations. It is not infrequently observable that, when a group assembles to discuss a contentious issue, a certain enthusiasm for a particular line is taken up and developed by the majority of participants, notwithstanding their previous positions on the subject. It is contended here that this is pre-eminently the case with Bryce, where the clarity of the main conclusions and the public unanimity of the Commissioners both

point to a crystalisation of widely-held beliefs in the country on the merits and direction of reform.

The Bryce Report of 1895 is taken as the starting point of this study, as it provides us with evidence both of the range of organisations declaring an interest in secondary education, at the national and local levels, and of the ideological positions which they espoused. In fact, in the period through to the Education Act of 1902, the main emphasis appears to have been on the organisation and control of education, rather than specifically on the curriculum itself. This does not imply that the period is not a fruitful one for research. On the contrary, one must ask why this should turn out to be the case, and it raises some interesting possibilities to explore which will turn on the relationships between the content of education and the means advanced for providing it, the two being inextricably linked. One reason for structural change is, after all, 'product' improvement. It does appear, and evidence will be presented to support this viewpoint, that a general ideological consensus on curriculum existed during this period. Following Kazamias:[1]

a) stratification of secondary schooling by financial, curricular and social criteria was accepted;

b) there was little conception of the necessity or desirability of universal secondary education;

c) secondary education was not seen as the logical and inevitable successor to elementary education;

d) it was generally agreed that specialisation in general, and the study of technical and practical subjects in particular, should be taken up only after an appropriate grounding in general education;

e) the hierarchy of descending status in curriculum ranged from literary and classical subjects, though scientific to the technical and practical.

More accurately, since views in opposition to these did exist, this list represents the *dominant* ideological position. In Plamenatz' terms, its 'spread' was sufficiently wide at the crucial organisational levels, and concern over the organisation of education sufficiently prominent, to relegate curriculum to an inferior place in national discussion of education at this time. The terms of reference of the Commission do not include it, although this is not to say that it was not discussed, at some length, nor that it was not subsequently to figure prominently in the Report in connection with the reform proposals. Those holding these dominant views, and in a position to give expression and effect to them, were disquieted by an important undercurrent of curriculum development, the emergence of a dynamic extension of elementary education based on scientific and technical subjects. This posed a threat, although paradoxically insufficient central power existed to meet and contain it. In terms of one of the hypotheses under observation in this study, the ability of one

organisation to have its views prevail over another depends partly on the type and degree of authority wielded, and on the quality of communications between the bodies.[2] The organisational measures taken in the education system up to and including the 1902 Act reflect, in great measure, an attempt to reduce the wide communications/control gap that existed between the centre and the school boards and schools, and to reduce fragmentation of institutions and approaches at the centre itself. Greater organisational control became the prerequisite for greater curricular control. More will be said on this subject in later chapters.[3]

The Royal Commission on Secondary Education was set up in early 1894, following the persuasive efforts of Michael Sadler, then actively involved in university extension work at Oxford. He had recognised that 'secondary education, which with us is at sixes and sevens, will have to be reorganised before the public seriously takes in hand the no less important task of permanently establishing higher education for adults'.[4] He petitioned the Hebdomadal Council of the university to convene a conference on secondary education. This took place in the autumn of 1893, and was followed by a petition to Gladstone in the November asking for the setting up of a Royal Commission, a request which was acceded to.

The Commission's terms of reference were:

> To consider what are the best methods of establishing a well-organised system of secondary education in England, taking into account existing deficiencies and having regard to such local sources of revenue for endowments or otherwise as are available or may be made available for this purpose and to make recommendations accordingly.

The Commissioners were to interpret this brief very liberally, and the minutes of evidence, reports and recommendations cover the question of secondary education comprehensively, not confining themselves solely to the question of administrative organisation. In part, this is a recognition that one cannot study structure without asking questions about the rationale of that structure. Indeed, a study which omitted this aspect would lack any coherence, and we are reminded that organisations, whatever internal aims they may generate, can be justified only in terms of their contribution to the attainment of external ends when set up in the public sector.[5] The minutes of evidence, in particular, provide much information about curricular patterns and prevailing ideologies, subject central to our enquiry which have suffered relative neglect in previous studies. The recommendations of the Commission, of a greater centralisation and unification of secondary education, cannot be seen simply as considered reaction to the technical, organisational deficiencies of fragmentation of control and funding that come across so clearly in the evidence taken.

Reference has been made to the 'mood' of the hearings. Witnesses were questioned by the Commission, and many questions were suggestive of particular answers which found favour with the interrogators, increasingly as the taking of evidence moved out of its early stages and patterns of response emerged, on such matters, for example, as the imbalance imparted to the curriculum by S.A.D. grants, or the impracticability or undesirability of opening up secondary education to more than a minority of the population. This is not to imply that a conspiracy existed amongst either Commissioners or witnesses to promote a particular line, for the term implies an activity both clandestine and planned, and designed to overturn or damage an existing state of affairs. It is too strong a term to use for the easy and open sharing of certain ideas which comes through forcibly in the hearings. We must remember, too, that the very existence of the Commission was predicated on a deficiency in the provision of secondary education, and it need come as no surprise that analysis and remedy should be the subject of general agreement, any more than if they were bitterly contested. Whether it is one or the other, or some point on the continuum between them, will depend upon the balance of interests involved, and upon the acceptance or otherwise of the premises of the enquiry and of the criteria for making judgements. In this case, the premise was that the provision of secondary education in England was disorganised and inadequate, and needed reform. It was deemed disorganised in that provision was fragmented and unbalanced, and not under acceptable central supervision, and inadequate in that much of what was provided for the appropriate

age group did not conform to the model of secondary education which was most widely held. In fact, one could not say (or, more accurately, a large majority of participants in the Bryce enquiry did not say), that a system of secondary education existed at all, if by this term one understands something structured and coherent and pursuant of a clearly-defined aim.

It has been noted that, within groups and organisations, the informal pattern of relationships and proceedings must not be neglected in favour of the formal and public if we wish to understand the unfolding of events.[6] With Bryce, the relative freedom of the hearings gives us insight into the ideological and other stances of questioners and respondents which are hidden, or only hinted at, by the measured prose of the official Report and Recommendations. There are other discernible differences of emphasis; the Recommendations presenting greater centralisation primarily as a bureaucratic response to the problems of co-ordinating and improving secondary education, whilst underplaying the ideologically important consideration of moving it away from the more technical and scientific mould that it was increasingly moving towards under the influence of S.A.D. activity and 'whisky money' funding. In the hearings, by contrast, fears over the character of secondary education come across quite as forcibly and continuously as does concern over structure. These points will be brought out in greater detail in the work which follows.

The analysis will consider firstly the hearings, and then the Report and Recommendations, each in terms of the three, interconnected areas of concern - ideology (p. 39), curriculum (p. 58) and organisation (p. 76). Ideology informs the curricular observations made, particularly with reference to the ideal of an 'educated' person, and is sufficiently strong to legitimise and support the reform movement, despite rearguard action from entrenched interest that will be referred to later, and which is so typical of organisational change.[7] Before embarking on this detailed study, however, a few words should be said about the reception which was given to the announcement of the Commission, and about the personnel involved and the balance of interests represented.

The Education Correspondent of *The Times* was typical in the welcome that he accorded it, accepting the principal motivation behind it:

> Mr Goschen *(financier and Liberal Unionist politician who rose to the Chancellorship under Salisbury in 1886)*, 20 years ago, described the condition of local government as a 'chaos of areas, a chaos of rates, and a chaos of authorities'. The present state of Secondary Education may be aptly described in the same classic phrase.[8]

He summarised the problem as follows:

1) Lack of rational structure, both in the authorities responsible for secondary education, and in the institutions providing it;

2) An incomplete and patchy national provision;

3) 'Revolution by a side wind', by which he meant the effect on the structure of education of the 'whisky money' provision of the 1890 Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Act, particularly in terms of its use in funding and extending the higher grade schools at the expense of grammar schools - '...all the efforts of the Endowed Schools Commissioners and their successors, plodding on for 30 years endeavouring to reorganise the grammar schools piecemeal and pick up a £ here and a £ there for secondary education, have been, by a mere stroke of the pen superseded by a grant which has more than doubled the whole money applicable to secondary education throughout the country';[3]

4) The 1890 money was given to the County Councils without clear guidelines for use, and much was wasted;

5) The activities of the S.A.D. encouraged the developments in 3).

He anticipated the Commission, and the majority of witnesses, in declaring that the work of the Charity Commission and of the S.A.D.

would have to undergo change. In addition, he predicted the problems to be faced:

> Can they devise an authority which with general (not universal) approval shall co-ordinate or consolidate the existing authorities, and be able to deal with institutions and funds for secondary education as a great whole, to reconcile the conflicting claims of parochialism and nationalism, of places and classes?[10]

The ideological battles that were to be joined in the hearings over the nature of secondary education were also anticipated as the Correspondent declared his position:

> Elementary education is (or ought to be) determinate in character, is for one class, and mainly the same in all districts. This is not the same with secondary education, which is necessarily indeterminate in character, embraces totally different classes, and must be flexible and adaptable to the very different needs of different districts.[11]

The Commission itself represented most of the interested parties, except the Education Department, the S.A.D., and the Charity Commissioners, who were involved only as witnesses. There was later criticism that there were no grammar school representatives, and that the body was too large and unwieldy (at seventeen) with insufficient heavyweight educational expertise.[12] Notes on the

composition of the Commission, and the representative status of members, are given at the end of this chapter.[13]

The Hearings: (1) Ideology

The ideological background to the Report that will be brought out in this analysis will illuminate that work on curriculum which follows. In practice, of course, the two shade imperceptibly into each other, with theories of what constitutes worthwhile knowledge, and of who should receive it at what stage of development, motivated primarily by ideological considerations. Most of the points to be made that relate directly to curriculum in the context of this work - primarily, what did, or should, constitute a 'Secondary Education' - will be dealt with later.

It has been noted that a dominant ideology does present itself in the pages of evidence so far as secondary education is concerned. It was to clash with, and then sweep aside, an alternative and threatening model. But an ideology is not embraced by all with equal vigour - as it undergoes change, some will be in the vanguard, espousing ideas not yet comfortably acceptable to the majority, while others lag behind in support of ideas largely superseded. The members of the Commission (see pp. 114-19) were typical in this respect, and in their considerations of the central issues of the investigation we may see how the thrust of questioning, and the mediating influence of participants, serve to define the central areas of agreement and to isolate the ideologically unacceptable.

It is necessary, firstly, to explore three interconnected ideas that were repeatedly expressed in the minutes of evidence and which received very little dissenting opinion. These were that secondary education should be the province of the minority; that it carried the danger of awakening unreasonable expectations of occupational, material and, by implication, social advancement; and that it should not be provided free to the majority of recipients.

All three of these ideas reflect fundamental views of the nature of social stratification, of the relationship of society to the individual, and of the individual's responsibility to himself and to his family. In general, witnesses had a conception of a society of clearly-defined grades with equally clearly-defined occupational statuses attached to them. The majority of the population, constituting the 'lower grades', were destined for the broad range of industrial and agricultural occupations. Above them, higher occupational status attached to clerical and artisan employment, and over this, very much a minority, stood the professions. As will be seen, the conception of secondary education adopted by many of the witnesses and Commissioners was that most appropriate to those either coming from, or aspiring to, the professional classes, and was not what most of them had in mind when thinking of the education of the majority. A ladder was seen to exist between the various grades, but the form of education that would make movement possible was to be earned, through scholastic merit, or paid for. Merit alone provided a means of advancement for a very small number, for, although desirable in itself, social stability

appeared more desirable. Most importantly, it must be emphasised that a more advanced education was never seen as a right - it was either earned or paid for, and the emphasis was always placed firmly on individual responsibility. Free, universal elementary education could be conceded without rocking the social boat overmuch, while free, universal secondary education could not.

With regard to the notion that secondary education should be reserved to the minority, this is well summed up in the exchange between Mr Cockburn, Chairman of the Leeds School Board and President of the School Boards Association of England and Wales, and Edward Hance, Clerk to the Liverpool School Board and himself the School Boards Association witness:

> ...One more question only: I suppose you admit that Secondary Education will always be for the few, rather than for the many; I mean to say, Secondary Education in the fullest sense of the term; I am not meaning higher grade education, as given in many of our schools, a little languages, and so on; but genuine Secondary Education will, I suppose, in your judgement, be the luxury of the few?
>
> - It is a question of a large few, or a small few. At present it is a small few; I hope it will be a large few.
>
> It will always be the luxury of a minority?
>
> - Yes.[14]

As well as giving some indication of the conception of secondary education implicitly applied by several Commissioners in their questioning, and serving as a model of the leading question, this quotation exemplifies the majority position adopted by both witnesses and Commission - indeed, the question of minority access to secondary education was not seen as problematic, but rather as a datum, for reasons partly practical and partly ideological. In practical terms, primarily economic and financial, entry to secondary education was limited by the size of parental or public purse, and by the perceived necessity to channel the majority into the occupations upon which the wealth and power of the country were based - increasingly, secondary industry. On the other hand, professional occupations within the still small tertiary sector yielded few opportunities by comparison. Giving to the masses 'Secondary Education in the fullest sense of the term' was seen to have little utilitarian benefit.

This type of occupational role-assignment and social demarcation are brought out by the reply of G.W. Kekewich, Secretary of the Education Department, to a question from the Chairman. Kekewich and the Education Department were to be the beneficiaries of the reorganisations that were to take place following the Board of Education Act of 1899, although Kekewich himself, as Secretary of the combined Board, was ousted in the autumn of 1902, shortly before his retirement, in favour of Morant:

Can you tell us anything with regard to the relation of evening continuation schools to Secondary Education?

- I think that the evening continuation school, if it is a continuation school proper is, and ought to be, a secondary school. Whatever system of Secondary Education you have in this country, the Secondary Education in day schools will only be for the few. The evening continuation school seems to be the Secondary Education for the people, for the artisans, and for the masses. I think that whatever system you have that kind of Secondary Education would be appended to it, and be useful as a general Secondary Education for the people.[15]

Here we see that the primary role of the majority was to work, not to continue in school, unless the school took place outside work hours, in which case a double benefit would accrue in the shape of a work-force that was willing to improve itself, but outside the hours of employment. Day school secondary education was equated with the 'full' education as understood by Cockburn, whilst evening schools were accorded lower status. Ideologically, the emphasis was on a social differentiation that appeared both natural and desirable to witnesses and Commissioners alike - again, an element in the discourse which appeared non-problematic to the majority involved.

Of particular importance in this context was a desire to avoid the difficulties that might arise if too large a number were educated beyond the ability of higher occupations, and social strata, to

accommodate them. Disaffection was to be avoided at all costs, even, it would seem, at the cost of economic progress. Lord Reay, Vice-President of the Council of University College, London, who was to become President in 1897 and, at the same time, Chairman of the London School Board, was to make the general point that 'the self-assertion of the semi-educated is the evil which, what I have ventured to call, sound education and thorough methods are intended to suppress as one of the great dangers of modern society'. Others were more explicit. The Bishop of London, Frederick Temple, then in his early seventies, had made a distinguished and lengthy contribution to nineteenth century education debate. He had been an influential member of the Taunton Commission of 1864-7, but declined a place on the Bryce Commission through pressure of work. His liberalism extended to improvement of the conditions of the working classes, but was firmly tempered by a commitment to amelioration through self-help. He had no doubts about the problems to be faced if secondary education were to be granted to more than a minority. He was questioned by Mr Llewellyn-Smith:

> The view your Lordship has expressed that there was a certain danger in carrying too many boys and girls on to secondary schools, and unfitting them for their surroundings, would chiefly apply, would it not, to any system which carried them beyond the period of entering a skilled industrial pursuit?
>
> - Yes.[16]

And in reply to Mr Lyttelton, Headmaster of Haileybury and Chairman of the Teachers' Guild, who asked whether he attached any importance to the argument that free secondary education would breed mass aversion to manual labour:

> - I think there is a good deal of importance to be attached to it. There is a strong tendency to bring up the children averse to manual labour, and as they get on to later years the aversion is increased by the fact that manual labour is very rarely so clean an employment as the labour of clerks and persons in those positions. You very soon find that the fact that you have to work in the dirt is a serious repulsion to a very great many.'[7]

It must be noted that the Bishop said this without any apparent trace of irony or over statement. Others concurred, equally forcefully, as in Sadler's exchanges with The Revd. McCarthy, of the Birmingham School Board, the second representative of the Association of School Boards. Sadler himself, of course, had done a great deal, when involved in the university extension work, to bring advanced education to the working man:

> Do you find that this kind of education (i.e. in second grade schools) is filling the minds of any of the children with a desire for the kind of life for which they have not the abilities adequate for success?

-... King Edward's School is doing that. We are drawing a large class of boys into secondary schools where they pick up ideas about their future career, which are clerkly in character and which they had much better not entertain as far as their own prospects are concerned.'[8]

The third connected point continuously made was that secondary education should not be universally free. The majority of respondents favoured a system of fee-paying for those who could afford it, and free places for a selected minority of those who could not. This arrangement would achieve two objectives - that secondary education would not be a major drain on public funds, and that entry to it would be restricted either to the acceptable social class or to a manageable number of the socially mobile. These points are summarised in the reply of Joshua Fitch, to a question on the extent to which secondary education should be given free. Like Temple, Fitch had worked on the Taunton enquiry, although as an Assistant Commissioner, and was almost an exact contemporary. Whereas Temple had made his educational debut as an Examiner in the Education Office in 1848, after public school and Oxford, Fitch began as a pupil-teacher in 1838, working thereafter in a number of schools, and in inspection and teacher-training. In the latter capacity, he had laid continuous stress on the importance to the teacher of a literary training. He made the public servant's objection to the large increase in expenditure that increased funding would entail:

Moreover, I think that the parents who desire Secondary Education are, as a rule, very well able to afford it. Of course, this only applies to the general provision for the education of those who are not selected as boys and girls of special merit. For them I would certainly reserve a great many free places. I think free places for those of special merit and payment for all those who require a higher education is the right principle...[19]

What comes clearly from this quotation is that secondary education provides two needs - for the selected poor, scholastic attainment and social standing; for the academically undistinguished fee-payer, possibly just the latter. This social function of secondary education is reinforced by the Bishop, who approached the question of making it a separate institution by advocating the setting up of schools 'distinctly of that character'. He continued:

...and I think that it would be probably wise - indeed I think certainly wise - to charge fees in such secondary schools. There are a great many parents who would rather pay the fees if their children were educated in schools of their own sort.

(Bryce)

- You consider that partly what we call social motives, and partly an increasing belief in the value of education, would

induce many parents to prefer the Secondary Education at £4 to the lower fee that has been mentioned?

- I feel very confident of it.[20]

He repeated Fitch's point that no secondary education should be free, except for the selected few, but went further, and typically so, in bringing the whole question back to one of individual responsibility:

> ...I do not quite see why the parent is to expect that his child should be educated beyond his own means of providing education, any more than that his child should be fed or clothed beyond his means of providing food or clothing...in all those cases I think that what the parents can do for them, determines what ought to be done for them.[21]

The doctrine is here expressed in a more uncompromising way than by most other respondents, but it is, nevertheless, implicit in many of their answers. Even a 'progressive', such as Hance, while advocating that the qualification for secondary education 'is not being able to pay for it, but having the abilities to make good use of it', could go no further than repeating the formula of fees plus scholarships.

What we have here is an elitist view of secondary education which will inform our later discussions of curriculum and organisation. Before moving on, however, it is necessary to consider further the

concept of 'Secondary Education' repeatedly used by Commission and witnesses, and the links between the various forms of post-elementary education in existence.

A difficulty that became apparent as soon as the hearings of evidence began was that no unambiguous definition of secondary education existed. It was sometimes described as any education between the elementary and the university, at other times in terms of the corresponding ages or Standards, so far as these were felt to give a good approximation. Some, such as the Bishop of London, gave secondary education a particular social characteristic, while others emphasised the subjects taught or the type of institution concerned. What is apparent, however, is that the common element in these definitions is that they are neither open nor comprehensive, but restrictive and implicit and, if implicitness is a good indicator of something deeply felt and shared at the ideological level, we have here something of fundamental importance to our enquiry. This is that secondary education by no means encompassed everything in post-elementary schooling, or even most of it. Rather, it was confined to the type of education, predominantly literary or classical rather than scientific or technical, to be found in the public boarding schools and the endowed grammar schools. The distinction at the post-elementary stage was often quite sharply drawn between this, which would lead on to the professions or university, and a more narrowly practical course of technical instruction, in separate institutions, for the majority going on to skilled or semi-skilled manual occupations, or

the lower clerical grades. As we shall see, the Commission was obliged, in its Report, to comprehend the technical in its recommendations for secondary education, as otherwise it be ignoring a sizable and necessary part of the provision of advanced education.[22] Both Bryce and Sadler, moreover, the dominant personalities on the enquiry, had publicly committed themselves to unification in education. Nevertheless, it must be said that this wider definition of secondary education does not sit comfortably with the views expressed in the hearings.

This distinction between the restricted definition of secondary education outlined above, and the remainder of advanced school-based education, is clearly made on several occasions. Sir John Donnelly, Secretary and permanent Head of the S.A.D. since 1884, and associated with its development since 1858, distinguished the two in terms of institutions and the character of their curricular provision:

> ...The organised science school is for a student who is going to work principally, if not entirely, in a scientific direction, whereas, the ordinary grammar schools aim at secondary instruction of an all-round character.
>
> (Hobhouse)
>
> You foster Secondary Education in a narrow sense of the term, as distinguished from a general sense of the term?
>
> - Yes.[23]

It should be noted that the organised science schools were mainly 'higher grade' elementary schools under school board control, which had expanded their curricula into advanced areas through financial sleight-of-hand in the administration of the rate made available to elementary education by the Education Act of 1870, and by taking advantage of S.A.D. grants and the disbursements of the County Councils under the 1890 Local Taxation Act. They were subject to the envy and suspicion of those who identified secondary education of a worthwhile nature only with the output of the public and grammar schools, and a long and ultimately successful campaign was to be waged that would end with their virtual eclipse after 1902. Brief mention will be made of this campaign later, but it is the curriculum which they promoted, rather than the institutions themselves, that we are most concerned with.

Two further short quotations reinforce the points made here. Both show the extent to which both questioners and respondents frequently shared viewpoints. In both, interestingly, we have witnesses involved in technical education who appear not to identify it with secondary education - rather, they saw it as a parallel, important, but essentially distinct phenomenon. The first involves a question to Mr W. V. Dixon, of the West Riding Technical Instruction Committee, on the financing of advanced education in schools and technical institutes:

(Yoxall)

> Would you argue that Secondary Education proper, literary Secondary Education of the endowed grammar school type, ought to receive a special grant for its maintenance?
>
> - It would be a great assistance if such a fund were available.[24]

It is instructive to see that James Yoxall, Secretary of the National Union of Elementary School Teachers, and representative of such institutions and personnel as Commissioner, had such a clearly-defined conception of secondary education, when it is remembered that he had every reason to defend the work of the higher grade elementary schools which had extended their activities comprehensively into more advanced areas.

In the second, the Dean of Manchester, Edward Maclure, left little room for manoeuvre in eliciting a response from Dr Garnett, of the Technical Education Board of the London County Council:

> You wish to have, I presume, a line of demarcation between those who may be said to be continuation scholars under the elementary school system and the children who will receive what we call Secondary Education?
>
> - Yes.[25]

The Reverend Maclure was one of two school board representatives on the Commission (as Chairman of the Manchester School Board), the

other being George Cockburn (see page 118). He was later to append his signature to a Memorandum to the Commission's Recommendations written by Yoxall, supporting a central reorganisation to include elementary, in addition to secondary, education.

To emphasise the observations made above, it must be noted that no natural line of progression was seen to exist between the various levels of schooling. The Report of the Taunton Commission (published 1868), set up to enquire into the education given in schools not covered by the Newcastle Commission on elementary schools (reported 1861) and the Clarendon Commission on the nine 'great' public schools (reported 1864), had institutionalised this idea with its classification of schools into those of the third, second and first grade, each progressively taking pupils further in terms of school-leaving age, breadth of curriculum, and social status. The Bryce Commission, in its Report, was to find it difficult to discard this heritage, efforts to the contrary notwithstanding, for it was seen as necessary and desirable that the majority should leave school at 12 or 13, or at maximum 14 to 15, years of age, while education beyond this would, and should, remain a minority interest. The main break along this range occurred at the lower end, where it was assumed that the majority would leave school, their education completed after the elementary stages. The current stage of economic development, and the cultural force of social stratification, were not seen to support a free-for-all in secondary education. Those continuing into secondary education 'proper', it was felt, would require a

different form of elementary education from those who would leave. Thus, not only did a particular conception of secondary education exist which was identified with the second, and particularly first, grade schools (but not with the work of the higher grade schools), but this was also linked with a form of elementary education which was considered unsuitable for those leaving early. We thus see a twin-track system of education, one form of the elementary stage for the majority which terminated at 12 or 13 years of age and which was a preparation for work, and the other distinctly a preparation for some form of secondary education which was to continue, possibly until 18 or 19 years of age. A picked minority might transfer, with some difficulty for want of adequate preparation, from the 'education for work' form of elementary provision, but no conception of a continuous and progressive educational ladder existed for the majority. Rather, two separate systems co-existed, one terminating at a relatively early age until the development of the higher grade schools began to pose a threat to conventional secondary education. Richard Jebb, Professor of Greek at the University of Cambridge, and its Conservative M.P., observed, in his questioning of the Bishop of London, that the Bishop, at the Oxford Conference of October 1893, had made three points about the educational system: firstly, that 'it would not be possible to have a regular continuation between the different classes of schools'; secondly, that 'each kind of school must stand apart'; thirdly, that 'nevertheless it would be possible to construct an educational ladder'. The Bishop, in his reply made clear what ladder he had in mind. For the average boy whose

parents could pay, the elementary school must 'distinctly prepare for the higher', whilst the 'picked boy' from the poorer classes would be severely restricted in numbers. In other words, for the adequately-prepared fee-payers, a route to secondary education existed which depended on income and, by extension, occupation and social standing, while for the bright but impecunious, in great competition with his fellows, advancement was by means of a sideways step from one ladder to the bottom of a separate one. The Bishop would make no provision at all for the average boy whose parents could not pay, and he thus differentiated clearly between pupils, in class terms alone, in deciding who should receive a secondary education. Similar points were made by Sir John Donnelly:

> If primary, secondary and higher education were three successive rungs of the educational leading one to the other, the question (about which level of education the Science and Art Department was concerned with) would be easy to answer. But as a matter of fact it is not so. Primary education as it is generally understood, is meant for boys who will not be leaving school at 12 or 13 years of age. What is called Secondary Education generally is the education of boys who are going into the business of life at 16 or 17 years of age. Lastly, in higher education, you have that of the university student. Well, the education which is adapted to the boy who is going into work at 13 years of age is and ought to be a different kind of thing from the education of the boy who is

going to the secondary school - I mean from the beginning; it is not a stepping-stone from one to the other...a properly-formulated Secondary Education should have a primary education of its own, different from that of the ordinary primary school. The education of the boy destined for the secondary or higher school, should be different, almost from the first, from that of the boy whose scholastic life is to stop at 12 or 13 years of age.[26]

In summary, from the evidence of witnesses (and Commissioners), four major points concerning ideology may be made about the educational system described. These points express views supported by the majority:

1) Secondary education was identified with the upper parts of public and grammar schools, and a liberal and non-utilitarian curriculum;
2) Secondary education was beyond the mainstream of educational provision, which was seen to end at 12 or 13 years of age, and no natural progression was seen to lead from the latter to the former;
3) Secondary education was for a minority only, and primarily identified with middle- and upper-class families who could afford to pay for it. Wealth and social standing were more important criteria for entry than merit alone;
4) Secondary education was to be denied to the majority on the grounds that it would be inappropriate to raise

unrealistic hopes of occupational (and therefore social) advancement.

(2) Curriculum

The terms of reference of the Commission did not explicitly include curriculum, but it was frequently discussed and was to become central to the enquiry and to the recommendations made. This was because, most obviously, a report on possible reorganisation of secondary education could not be made without first articulating, through the give-and-take of question and answer, a conception of what secondary education meant to the majority of participants, a process in which curricular considerations were to the forefront. As we have seen, the dominant ideology, at the time, dictated the requirement of a particular type of curriculum offered in a particular type of school, over a certain age range to pupils drawn almost exclusively from certain defined social classes. Of these requirements, the curricular were the most important, as the approval and transmission of certain types of knowledge must always be when they play such a crucial part in legitimising the occupational standing of one group compared to another.

Of all the references made to curriculum, overwhelmingly the most numerous were in the form of criticisms which struck sympathetic chords in the Commission, who were to refer to them repeatedly in the Report to support their recommendations. These criticisms concerned the direction that post-elementary education was taking in schools, the sources of finance that were making the development possible and, most importantly, the curricular imbalances that were resulting. These imbalances were seen in terms of an over emphasis

on scientific and technical subjects, and a relative neglect of the literary. Technical subjects were variously defined, but their essential characteristic was that they were work-orientated and therefore not associated with a 'Secondary Education'. Musgrave has traced the changing conceptions of technical education.[27] The Devonshire Report on Scientific Instruction and the Advancement of Science (published 1872-5) included a section on science in the public and endowed schools and in elementary schools and training colleges. The witness J.G. Greenwood quoted the R.S.A. definition of technical instruction as 'general instruction in those sciences, the principles of which are applicable to various specified employments of life.... excluding the manual instruction in arts and manufactures which is given in the workshop'. Here we see a distinction made between classroom work and practical experience, the latter being excluded from the definition. By contrast, the Final Report of the Cross Commission (1888) on the workings of the Elementary Education Acts, England and Wales, gives the extended definition of technical instruction as 'instruction in those scientific and artistic principles which underlie the industrial occupations of the people.... as well as instruction in the manual practice involved in the application of these principles'. Thus, no consensus existed at this time as to whether or not workshop experience was to be included. This is not necessarily important, the crucial distinction being made between the technical, whether on the narrower or broader definitions, and the liberal. For our purposes, we shall refer to the Technical Instruction Act of 1889,

which made the firm link between technical education and the S.A.D. that gave rise to so much concern in the Bryce hearings:

> (Technical instruction is) instruction in the principles of science and art applicable to industries, and in the application of specific branches of science and art to specific industries or employments. It shall not include teaching the practice of any trade or industry or employment, but save as aforesaid, it shall include instruction in the branches of science and art with respect to which grants for the time being made by the Department of Science and Art, and any other form of institution (including modern languages and commercial and agricultural subjects) which may for the time being be sanctioned by that Department by a minute laid before Parliament...[28]

The origin of the concern was three-fold:

1) Participants had a conception of secondary education, described earlier, which was general in character and had major literary elements. It was associated with the public schools and the endowed grammar schools, and was emphatically not related directly to employment;
2) The initiative in post-elementary education had moved away from the grammar schools, in terms of growth and numbers, towards the higher grade elementary schools, which had been responding to a need for advanced education which the

grammar schools had not met. However, the curricular patterns characteristic of the higher grade schools emphasised the scientific and technical, at the expense of the literary, and thus threatened conventional ideas of what a secondary education should comprise. It was certainly not felt that everyone should receive a 'full' secondary education of the grammar school type, and it was considered desirable that the new and vigorous model should have its growth curtailed and status reduced, lest it acquire a legitimacy of its own that would have major social repercussions;

3) The major source of new funds coming into post-elementary education, the very life-blood of the schools, was going to the higher grade schools, not the grammar schools, and the conditions attached to these funds were largely responsible for the curricular imbalances which were so deplored.

So, a real danger was perceived, not only that the curriculum was developing inappropriately, but that the State was indirectly aiding this development through the activities of the S.A.D. and the application of the Technical Instruction Acts of 1889 and 1891 and the permissive Local Taxation Act of 1890. More will be said about these later, in the analysis of organisation,[29] but it is worth mentioning briefly that a major source of independent development, of organisation or movement, is to have an adequate level of funding that is not under the control of the central

authority.[30] A large and growing source of finance was here available for the expansion of technical education that was not matched by an equivalent source for the more literary studies associated with 'Secondary Education'. The higher grade schools depended principally on this finance for their continued existence, but the formal restriction on its use to technical subjects (although widely interpreted) restricted their autonomy in curricular planning. As an example, Mr J.F Moss, clerk to the Sheffield School Board, described the curriculum for boys in 'ex-Standard V11 - 2nd and 3rd year', of the Central Higher School (Standard V11 referred to the upper limit of elementary education on which Education Department grants could be obtained and for which a rate could be legally levied under the 1870 Act). It may be agreed that the school 'has devoted itself more especially to the scientific side of the education', but not that 'we do cultivate the literary subjects, and it gives a pretty full Secondary Education':

> Ex-Standard V11 - 2nd and 3rd year: mathematics; machine construction and drawing; inorganic chemistry (theoretical and practical); practical and plane solid geometry; theoretical mechanics; acoustics; light and heat; manual instruction; drawing; English; French; a few take Latin; scripture.[31]

These were the upper two years of this higher grade school, and they were typical of what was available in advanced education for the boy who had come up through the elementary system and who had

been unable to transfer to the grammar school with its somewhat more balanced curriculum.

Despite his protestations about the implicit charge of neglect of literary studies (a defensive reaction frequently in evidence amongst those associated with the provision of education in higher grade schools), Mr Moss was under no delusions about the nature or source of the problem, as his answers to the Chairman's questioning testify:

> It has a strong scientific tendency?
>
> - Yes, I am afraid we have been led to cultivate the sciences for financial reasons, but it has been felt that it is very desirable to pay more attention to the literary subjects, and encourage a wider culture.
>
> What are the financial reasons?
>
> - That we have been able to earn large grants from the Science and Art Department for science and arts, and there are no equivalent grants for the modern languages and literature to be earned in respect of children beyond the Standards.[32]

The situation was summarised by Mr Fitch, and his reply foreshadowed organisational reforms that were to be proposed by the Commission, reforms that were to make the clear link between organisation and curriculum:

A higher grade school... is in this position when the boys have passed the Seventh Grade and are 14 years of age, that the board can no longer claim a grant from the Education Department. Many boards would like... to carry on the general education of the boy... but they cannot do that. They are forced, by the fact that the only grant is that which they get from the Science and Art Department, to turn the whole of their power in the direction of what is called 'science'. They can get no grants except for subjects that are in the syllabus of the Science and Art Department. This appears to me to be a thing very much to be regretted, because it prevents your having a rounded and complete system of higher grade schools.[33]

This situation had organisational as well as curricular implications because it linked a widespread but deficient curricular movement with the separation and independence of the two central governmental bodies concerned with education in schools, the Education Department and the S.A.D. so the reforms that were later to be proposed were seen to have curricular implications. More detailed evidence to support this view will be adduced in the analysis of the Report and Recommendations.

That the system developing in the higher grade schools was very widely disapproved of, may be seen in this extract from the Dean of Manchester's questioning of the Reverend McCarthy. Both, it may be remembered, represented school board interests:

Are you now expressing your own views with respect to the unsatisfactory nature of the science and art grants, or is the view held to any large extent generally by persons taking an interest in education?

- Practically by everybody I know; certainly by the Birmingham Board, from its experience; and by the teachers of these schools. I have never heard an expression of approval of the Science and Art directory system for a day school for boys and girls.[34]

But, why, Maclure asked, could nothing be done?:

Have you made any representations to the Science and Art Department on the question?

- As a Board, do you mean?

Yes.

- No, I do not think that we have. The money payment is so liberal from the Science and Art Department that we do not like to look a gift horse in the mouth.[35]

The Association of School Boards had also, previously, presented a precis of their views on the operation of grants to the Commission. We may see here further evidence of the considered deficiencies of the curriculum which it sponsored. McCarthy quoted from it:

The master of the Bridge Street School says: 'The science and art grants necessitate working to the science and art syllabus, which is the same for boys with no workshop experience as for men - factory operatives - attending evening science classes... Moreover, the science and art courses, as at present defined, direct the method of teaching, or of acquiring scientific knowledge, in certain of the subjects. Taking chemistry as an example, there is extremely little that trains boys to become inquisitive and acquisitive... '
You also say 'one-sided curriculum encouraged (non-recognition of languages and literature)'. That would apply to that school as well?
- Yes.[36]

Many witnesses speculated, increasingly with encouragement from the Commission, that grants should be made available in aid of literary as well as scientific subjects, and this was to give further weight later to the Commission's amalgamation proposals. As an indication of the way that the Commission was beginning to move, we can cite an exchange between the Chairman and Sir William Hart-Dyke. Sir William was a prominent Conservative politician, M.P. for Dartford from 1885 to 1906 and Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education between 1887 and 1892. In 1890 he had been involved in the first steps in dismantling the system of payment by results promoted by the S.A.D. and hateful to liberal educationists:

Some witnesses have told us that the effect of the Science and Art grants given in the upper departments of the elementary schools has been to give too great a prominence to the science side of what may be called the lower grade of secondary education; and that the Science and Art grants continue to be given in that way they ought to be given for literary as well as for purely science subjects in order to let the literary subjects have a fair chance. Have you any opinion to express on that point?

- Yes, I have a strong opinion about that; I have constantly observed and noticed that the great danger in these schools is that the grant-earning subjects are generally seized upon, and, of course, one has to be very careful, in administering a grant of that kind, that it should not be the case. As you say, the literary portion ought to have a fair share with the others.[37]

A similar idea was expressed by Dr Poole, Chairman of the Headmasters' Association and the Master of Bedford Modern School. Again, we may feel that the questioner (Yoxall) expressed a positive attitude towards the proposals made:

...I understand Dr Poole to mean that a certain portion of the money should be taken entirely away from technical education and adapted to general Secondary Education of the literary and classical order?

- We think the present grant should not only be used for technical education pure and simple, but a great part of it should be open to secondary schools.

Literary and classical education in secondary schools?

- Yes.[39]

In addition to the frequent references to the curriculum imbalances in higher grade schools, a related question, or possibly the same question in different form, was prominent. This concerned the importance of a general educational grounding before the commencement of a more specialist study. Criticisms of existing over-specialisation centred, once again, on the technical and scientific subjects, with desirable compensatory change seen in terms of more literary study. Of more than passing interest is the fact that those involved in technical education were amongst the most enthusiastic supporters of a good general grounding. Their support was to be referred to in the Report to add weight to the reform proposals designed to reduce the independent power of the S.A.D.. It is not clear whether they would have given such a strong endorsement to the idea had they been able to predict the future run of events and foresee the sustained, and ultimately successful, attacks on the higher grade schools and their curricula that were to come.

The representatives of the Association of Headmasters of Higher Grade and Organised Science Schools, perhaps predictably, were noticeably less concerned about the application of the science and

art grants. Organisation theory reminds us that the 'work unit' (the school, in this case), as the last, but fundamental, part of the structural chain, will often exhibit a rationale and policy commitment quite distinct from higher, co-ordinating bodies. We can here compare the schools' position on the grants with that of the school boards.[39] Be that as it may, the schools' representatives nevertheless strongly supported the necessity of a sound general education. They had advocated the setting up of a local education authority, or educational board, to administer all 'higher' (post-elementary but pre-university) education, remarking that the main need, nationally, was for sound preparatory work. Henry Hobhouse, Liberal Unionist M.P. and Chairman of the Somerset Technical Education Committee, questioned the President of the Association, the Headmaster Dr Forsyth:

> In fact, you think that they must aid Secondary Education generally in order to form the best basis for technical instruction?
> - Yes, every professor tells me now that the fault he has to find with his pupils is that they are not prepared sufficiently for university or technical instruction.[40]

Sir Bernhard Samuelson, former Chairman of the Technical Education Commission, went further, stating that he would not be disposed to fund 'Secondary Technical Education' at all unless it were combined with a general education, 'because I do not think technical education can be effectively given unless it is combined with

general education...and not only that, I think that for higher technical education good general education is absolutely essential'. He favoured technical instruction within technical departments or classes attached to 'secondary schools' in order to achieve this aim. The witnesses from the Association of School Boards agreed with him, noting the advantages to be gained if staff engaged in teaching literary subjects on the 'non-technical' side were to pass over to the technical side, and vice versa with the teachers of mathematics and science.

Mr Hance, of that Association, was to take up most of these points in later evidence to the Commission. The Chairman questioned him:

> I observe that you confirm what has been before us in evidence constantly, that separate technical schools are not educationally desirable; have you anything further to say upon that point? You mean, I suppose, schools entirely devoid of the literary element?
>
> - Yes, I should look upon those as rather workshop preparation than education.[41]

He was further questioned by Lady Frederick Cavendish:

> As they now stand, are you condemning them?
>
> - Yes, as portion of education. I do not wish to say that they are not exceedingly valuable; I do not wish to underrate

the workshop system; I think it a very useful institution, but I do not call it an educational institution.[42]

Bryce concluded:

On the other hand. you consider that technical education should be intermixed with general education?

- That is so...

What you want is a proportion of the literary and the technical elements?

- Yes... but so far as it is considered part of the general educational machinery, scientific and technical instruction... should, I think, preferably form part of the instruction given by institutions supplying also instruction of a more general character. Exclusive devotion to subjects of this nature, at the comparatively early age at which they must ordinarily taken up, is calculated to produce a somewhat lopsided mental development.[43]

There are several observations that we can make from these latter exchanges which will stand as summary of the general feeling about technical education:

1) It was considered deficient in literary elements, especially when it took place in a separate institution;
2) It did not constitute a 'full Secondary Education';
3) It needed to be balanced with a general education;

4) Both technical and general education should, in preference, take place within the same institution.

References have been made to the disproportionate amount of funding going to the scientific and technical subjects compared to the literary and classical, and disapprobation that this aroused in those whose conception of school-based advanced education tended towards the latter rather than the former. However, what affects subjects affects also the institutions in which those subjects are taught, and several witnesses extended the anxiety that they felt about the curricular problems towards the difficulties that they saw for the grammar schools. These fears were for the curricular health and vigour, and curricular orthodoxy, of the institutions that they saw as the standard-bearers of secondary education. The schools' difficulty was that they could not adopt the curriculum demanded by the S.A.D., or the various Acts aiding technical education, without losing their essential curricular and social character. However, an unwillingness to compromise meant a refusal to accept a rich source of funds that was financing a threatening initiative by the higher grade schools. This dilemma is brought out in Sir John Donnelly's reply to a question from Mr Sadler:

> How far do you find that the system of the organised science school is being combined with the ordinary work of the secondary schools, the larger part of the curriculum of which is of a literary character

> - So far as the organised science school curriculum is concerned, the schools taking it up are not as a rule the ordinary secondary or endowed schools. The endowed schools... having their grammar school curriculum, cannot very well devote the time that we require for the science instruction in an organised science school. Therefore they take instruction in one or two subjects alone, and do not take the full course of the organised science school.[44]

Sir George Young, Charity Commissioner, concurred, observing that 'the effects of legislation which recently applied a very large sum through the county councils in aid of education in a technical sense is having an effect upon the grammar schools'. He feared also that 'if the present state of things is left unaltered, it cannot but have a prejudicial effect upon the teaching in the schools'. One of the main aims of the Bryce Commission was to become, within its terms of reference, that the situation would *not* remain unaltered.

What we have, in the preceding analysis, is a sustained attack on the advanced curriculum which had been emerging in the various types of higher grade schools, in terms of subject bias, curriculum deficiency, and detrimental effect on the grammar schools. Whilst one may find many sympathetic, supportive, even fiercely loyal, defences of the higher grade school, these are not in terms of curriculum. Rather, they reflect a loyalty towards an institution that stepped into the educational gap and made an advanced

education, albeit an unbalanced one, available to so many who would not otherwise have received the chance to proceed beyond the elementary. In some ways, the praise is self-congratulatory, the justifiable pride of those involved in setting up a workable system under difficult circumstances, manipulating as they did the various sources of finance that could be stretched to cover this important area. In other ways, it reflects the defensive reaction of all organisations under threat, to justify in terms of efficiency in pursuing a particular purpose. But never was there any doubt in anyone's mind that the curriculum of the higher grade schools was not a full secondary curriculum, however 'useful' it may be. Appeals to pragmatism are never sufficiently strong, by themselves, to overcome the demands of deeply-held prejudice. We may summarise the ideological consensus and the implications it was to have for the Report as follows:

1) 'Secondary Education' took place in grammar and public schools, not in higher grade schools. However, the higher grade school work satisfied the age criterion for determining what was secondary and, to some extent, the curricular. How, then, was it to be accommodated within the Commission's brief?

2) The criteria for distinguishing 'Secondary Education' from other advanced school-based education were social as well as curricular;

3) Because of the social criterion, it is a matter of speculation as to whether the higher grade school would

have been considered 'Secondary' even if its curriculum had been identical to that of the grammar school, because no parity of social esteem existed. This social disparity reflected, in part, the accumulated weight of tradition in public education enjoyed by the grammar schools, as compared with the mundane, utilitarian image of the higher grade schools. A rough parallel might be drawn between modern universities and polytechnics;

4) In fact, the curriculum of the higher grade school was considered seriously deficient in terms of non-technical and non-scientific subjects, and could therefore be safely attacked on educational grounds alone. There was no necessity to go further, although some, such as the Bishop, did feel it important to stress the desirability of maintaining a social gap between the two different types of institution.

The attack begun in the hearings was to be refined, but accommodated, in the Report and Recommendations.

(3) Organisation

The question of organisation is a complex one, touching as it does all aspects of structure, control and finance. Radical organisational proposals in education are rarely made purely in the interests of technical efficiency, as might be the case, for example, in manufacturing industry, since the goals to which the reorganisation is directed are informed by ideological considerations of the desirable distribution of knowledge and social power. Changes of a technical nature, which may include, for example, the pursuit of cost efficiency, must be understood within this ideological context. They are not ends in themselves, but necessary to the achievement of the primary educational goals. The reorganisation proposals made by the witnesses in the Minutes of Evidence, and by the Commissioners in the Report, should be seen in this light, even though, in the latter case, the terms of reference of the Commission, and the necessity to stay publicly within them, may have masked the extent to which ideology played a guiding role in their deliberations. However, as with the discussion of ideology and curriculum, we begin this work on organisation with the hearings, and more revealing discourse that relatively spontaneous, semi-public interrogation gives us.

Throughout the discussions, two issues predominate. One is a sustained attack on the activities of the S.A.D. and their supposed responsibility for the curricular imbalances in higher grade schools. The other follows from the first and concerns

amalgamation proposals for the Education Department, the S.A.D., and the Charity Commission, proposals clearly made with curricular reform in mind, and in particular a defence of the conception of secondary education outlined earlier, quite as much as with the undoubted deficiencies and anomalies in the control and funding of the educational infrastructure.

Of the attacks on the S.A.D., three points may be made: firstly, that the Commission was generally somewhat hostile to its witnesses, made them uncomfortable, and sought to elicit responses to confirm its increasing conviction that an independent grant-giving Department was educationally undesirable; secondly, that the Department adopted a defensive posture towards the Commission; thirdly, that the Department became aware of the threatening portents and announced, in vain as it turned out, that it had instigated a reform of its directory system that would give greater emphasis to literary subjects in the schools that it supported.

On several occasions, the S.A.D. witnesses gave responses that found little favour with the Commission - in fact, they became unintentionally adept at making the 'wrong' reply to questions concerning their activities. It was necessary, firstly, for the Commission to establish the range and limits of the Department's responsibilities. It was seen that these were to be defined, primarily, in terms of the satisfaction of the conditions laid down for the receipt of grants, and not in terms of particular institutions or over particular age ranges. However, the actual

operation of the grant, as we have seen, had the equally undesirable results of promoting a scientifically biased curriculum in the higher grade schools, whilst excluding the grammar schools from their benefits. Moreover, the Department was effectively the only organisation aiding pupils beyond Standard V11 in non-endowed schools, and it was this monopoly of unrestricted control, which had led to an unbalanced extension of curriculum in Board schools while grammar schools languished, that so concerned the Commission.

Sir John Donnelly was the principal witness. He was to retire in 1899, somewhat wearied by the onslaughts of the Bryce Commission and the hearings of the Museums Committees which followed in 1897-98. He noted the separation of the S.A.D. from the Education Department, and went on to answer questions, firstly from Bryce, and then from Hobhouse, about its connection with secondary education:

> You would not yourself, I suppose, undertake to draw a line, so far as the operation of your Department go, between what may be called elementary and what may be called secondary education?
>
> - No. I suppose in a certain sense all the instruction that is aided by my Department is distinctly secondary instruction, except drawing in elementary schools...

As I understand it, you have nothing to do with higher grade board schools as such. The institutions your Department deals with, are organised science schools and science and art classes?

- Yes.[45]

This would seem to have implied an even-handedness in dispensing grants to grammar schools and higher grade schools alike, but the reality was different. Note, by the way, how Hobhouse used the term 'secondary school' to refer to the grammmar school, thereby excluding the higher grade school from such a designation - this was a frequent occurrence in the hearings. It was not that the Department was unwilling to aid a qualifying grammar school, rather that the grammar school was unwilling to move far enough in the direction of scientific subjects to take advantage of what was on offer. It was, therefore, to some extent a self-imposed restriction, but one which could not be broken without renouncing claim to the acceptance and legitimacy that accompanied the provision of a literary curriculum. The dilemma of the grammar schools, and the defects of the funding arrangements, are brought out in an exchange between Bryce and Donnelly. The latter had been outlining some modifications to Departmental requirements which had been made to give more emphasis to the literary:

So that it would be possible for a school to devote half its time to literary subjects and yet become an organised science school under this new scheme?

> - It would be possible, but I do not know that it would succeed very well as an organised science school under such a scheme; I do not think its grants would be very large.[46]

The grammar schools problem, however, was overshadowed by that of curriculum, for their defence was linked with their function as vehicles for the conventional type of secondary education which was being threatened by the higher grade schools and their financial sponsors of the S.A.D. (statistics quoted in the Report showed that S.A.D. grants were running at a level of more than £170,000 p.a., and 'whisky money' disbursements through the County Councils at about £530,000 p.a.). In their evidence, the Departmental witnesses, often quite disingenuously, gave the Commission ammunition to use against them. They agreed that literary subjects received less attention in the schools, and that the Department was unable to supervise them adequately. Sir John responded to questions on this point put to him by Edward Lyttelton, Headmaster of Haileybury and Chairman of the Teachers' Guild:

> - ... As it stands now, from the fact that we do not look into the literary instruction in many of the organised science schools, I am afraid that it is being neglected more than it ought to be...
>
> ... But supposing a school, in its desire to gain your grant, were to cut down the other subjects to an absurdly small limit, would it come to your knowledge at all?

- No, I do not think it would directly; it might indirectly. Of course that is really a matter for the governors of the school. No doubt they have the school inspected...[47]

William de W. Abney,[48] Director of Science at the S.A.D. since 1893 in succession to Donnelly and, like the latter, a Royal Engineer, reinforced this in reply to a question from Bryce:

We have had it in evidence that, as regards a good many of the organised science schools, the literary subjects are comparatively thrown into the shade, but your view is that this is not generally true?

- No, I do not think it is. There is no doubt that a great many hours are devoted to literary subjects. What progress is made we have no opportunity of seeing.[49]

The gentleman only succeeded, with the latter admission, in showing the Commission of the falsity of his initial reply, mindful as they were of the weight of evidence on this matter previously submitted to them.

Proposals were laid before the Commission by the Department for it to take a greater role in the oversight of the literary, but they carry the air of expediency rather than conviction. In the following passage, where Donnelly is questioned by Lyttelton, the Secretary succinctly, but in my view unintentionally, summarised the neglect:

As I understand, you suggest that the Science and Art Department should take note of Secondary Literary Education?

- In the organised science schools.

Would that not rather add to the overlapping and chaos of the present system?

- I do not see that it would in any way, because it is not as if the organised science school was inspected by the Education Department. As it is at present, this organised science school is inspected and looked into qua science and art instruction alone, and the literary instruction is left to take care of itself, except so far as the committee or managers choose to look after it. No Department touches it. Therefore, we should not be overlapping anybody else's work.[50]

And the following proposal to Sadler's enquiry looked inadequate:

> Under the modified scheme that you suggested just now, would you entrust the duty of reporting upon both the literary and the scientific work of the school to one and the same Inspector?
>
> - I think every now and then, perhaps every two or three years, you might send round a specialist, but I think, as a rule, the one man might be able to do for both. It is only the instruction of boys up to 16 years or so...[51]

Abney was more defiant - one might even say unrepentant - in the face of unfriendly questioning. He did not regret that boys should

be turned towards scientific careers, agreed that the organised science schools were not the place for the non-scientific, and bluntly stated that the duty of the Department had been to provide for the latter. In effect, he washed the Department's hands of responsibility for general literary education, and threw a challenge back to the Commission which was later to be taken up. Bryce provided the opportunity:

> What is suggested is that the arrangements of the Science and Art Department have prevented them from being provided for in schools having a literary curriculum, because they have been drawn by the grants into schools with a predominantly scientific curriculum. That is what the witnesses have suggested, and it is upon that point that we invite your opinion. I will put it in other words: the witnesses ascribe to the action of the Science and Art Department the fact that many boys who are better fitted for a literary course nevertheless follow a scientific course. Can you suggest any remedy for that state of things?
>
> - I think this Royal Commission will most probably find the most efficient remedy.[52]

He compounded his faults by admitting that the new aid for literary subjects proposed by the Department would only apply to organised science schools, and that it would not therefore be aiding those subjects in 'schools which were of a more literary character'. Mr Cockburn waxed indignant at this and berated the witness:

Then does not the position in which you find yourself before the Commission emphasise the misfortune that the Education Department which takes literary work under its special care, ceases to give any kind of substantial encouragement after Standard V11, and South Kensington continues to go on with substantial encouragement very much beyond that time. Is that the fact?

- Yes, I think it is.

And that if literary encouragement is to be given to such boys as you have indicated, it will have to come from some rearrangement of the Whitehall side of instruction, as you have rearranged yours at South Kensington?[53]

- Yes.[54]

Donnelly had initially been called rather early in the hearings. He returned much later to explain in more detail the provisions of the new regulations that the Department had drawn up to enhance the position of literary subjects in organised science schools. He had not mentioned these at all during the first appearance, and one must assume that the tenor of the proceedings had awakened the Department to the real risk which threatened its independent existence. He stated that, in an average school week of 25 to 30 hours, a minimum of 8 hours would have to be devoted to literary work, and that this would be insisted on as a condition of receiving the grant. He emphasised at several points the rigour with which the Department pursued the ideal of a balancing

literary element in a predominantly scientific curriculum, and quoted from the current Departmental directory:

> An organised science school is one in which the instruction in science is carried on methodically according to the course specified in Section 23; but in preparing the timetable, provision should be made for instruction in those literary subjects which are essential for a good general education.[55]

But this was too little, and too late. The Department had shown the wrong priorities and had, in many ways, been too successful in pursuing a course which offended the ideals of others. In Yoxall's instructive terms, its work was 'secondary in an educational sense purely, and not at all in a social sense'.

With respect to remedies for the deficiencies in the existing secondary system witnesses, with the exception of the S.A.D., showed a broad measure of agreement - that there should be amalgamation of the three central bodies with educational responsibilities in this area (the Education Department, the S.A.D., and the Charity Commission with respect to its educational functions), and a unifying institution at local level to cover voluntary and board schools. The Commission itself took up this line of thought quite early in the proceedings, and it will be remembered that commentary in the press before the hearings started had already anticipated this probability.[56] This statement from Bryce, part of a question put to a witness, typifies the point:

At present we are faced with the fact that there are rather too many authorities who are all having their fingers in the educational pie. It has been suggested that we should diminish the number of authorities and simplify the organisation...[57]

The most comprehensive survey of the problem came from Sir William Hart-Dyke. He remarked on the 'tangled condition into which by degrees our whole education as a system below the universities had drifted', a situation resulting from a 'compromise of contending forces' at the local level which had followed from the provisions of the 1870 Act. He favoured a properly constituted Education Department headed by a Minister, with one authority to complement it at each local level. In addition to the general advantages of simplification and streamlining, he saw the more specific benefits of 'economy' and 'efficiency'. Both were linked to the pursuit of 'value for money', a necessary consideration for the many who had yet to be convinced of the desirability of public funding in secondary education. The Taunton Report had made much of the lack of interest in educational matters, and the social problems to be faced if compulsory rate finance were given to secondary education:

...the burden cast on the ratepayers as far as they are distinct from the parents would be so heavy, as to run great risk of causing serious discontent, and that such burdens can only be borne, when they have been assumed by slow degrees, and all other expenditure has been gradually adjusted to meet them...[88]

'Efficiency' had further connotations - removal of duplication of effort by clarifying lines of communication. Sir William spoke of the use of technical instruction funds:

> I have no doubt that a large portion of that money in different counties has been wasted, because, although an immense deal of earnest work has been done with regard to the adoption of that Act (*i.e. the Technical Instruction Act of 1889*) in different counties, wherever I go I learn that they have been left very much without guidance at starting, and a much greater amount of expenditure would have been saved, and an enormous amount of efficiency secured, if there had been some guiding spirit at headquarters.[89]

We saw in the analysis of curricular points that Sir William favoured redressing the balance in higher grade schools between literary and scientific subjects. He was willing to go further, on Bryce's prompting, and support a more equitable distribution of public funds between the two:

If secondary education became a part of the work of the reconstituted Education Department, then it would be possible so to distribute these grants, which are now given outside the work of the Education Department proper, as to enable them to assist the literary as well as the scientific continuation study?

- Yes.[60]

With the exception of the S.A.D., witnesses were agreed on the 'mischievous' nature of the dual control at higher grade school level. In the following extract from the Reverend McCarthy's testimony, we can see how intimately the criticisms of, and reform proposals for, the existing system were tied in with the deficiencies in curriculum that the system had produced. He was asked what was wrong with dual control, and replied:

- It prevents a progressive and well-arranged course being devised from the beginning through the schools. For Standard 7 they are under the Education Department and partly under the Science and Art Department, and then beyond Standard 7 they are practically under the Science and Art Department. There are 2 departments for the first year, and then the Science and Art Department for the rest of the time, and the Science and Art Department, as I have shown you, is unsuited to that class of school.[61]

Mr Fitch agreed, saying that 'it is a misfortune that the Science and Art Department is practically so much separated from the Education Department, and more particularly in the matter of grants', also that 'it involves considerable waste of administrative power and many inconveniences'. He had visited, with an inspection team, as part of a survey commissioned by the Admiralty, technical schools, higher grade schools, and continuation schools, and 'we found that in every case, when we asked what their curriculum of study was, it was entirely regulated by the Science and Art Department'. The remedy to him was clear, 'that the Science and Art Department should become an integral part of the Education Department'.

The Ministry, or Board, that the amalgamation would produce, was not seen as all-powerful. Its function in curricular matters was to redress existing defects, largely through reform of the grant system, but by no means to act as a directorate. In this matter witnesses stood squarely together. The Association of School Boards thought it 'might guide...and give suggestions', and Dr Poole of the H.M.A. stressed local independence in reply to Bryce:

> Would it be within your view that the central educational council should have power to provide in general terms what the curricula of particular schools, or particular classes of schools, might be?

- Yes, with a fair amount of latitude. I think there ought to be a considerable amount of latitude in provincial districts...

Taking what is called a general liberal education, you would leave it to the central council to provide what the constituent elements might be?

- I think they might do so, but not over-rigidly.[62]

Kekewich of the Education Department agreed with this viewpoint. Asked by Dr Fairbairn whether a central authority would not 'tend to force on Secondary Education a hard and uniform standard', he replied, making, as he did, a scarcely-veiled criticism of the S.A.D.:

I think that depends on the way that the central authority did its duty and did its business. I think the time has gone by for the weight of iron imposition of its will by a central authority. I think that it is in accordance with public opinion at this time that the central authority in dealing with whatever it has to deal with - the local authorities, the teachers, and the standard adopted, as so forth - should allow the utmost elasticity.[63]

The cynical might say that the Education Department could afford to be reasonable and 'progressive', as it stood to gain most from a reorganisation. Indeed, the attitudes projected by the three organisations which were the subject of reform proposals stand in

marked contrast to one another. The Education Department was confident, its Secretary being at times somewhat brusque with the Commission, but it made a studied effort not to push its own case to the point of alienating the Commissioners. Indeed, it had no need to do so, as it was supported quite adequately by other witnesses. The Charity Commission, at least in the person of its head, Sir Henry Longley, seemed to accept its fate with equanimity, and there is a sense almost of relief at the prospect of casting off a burden of educational administration that sat uncomfortably amongst its other duties.[64] The Endowed Schools Acts had conferred on it the task of making schemes, either original or amending, for the endowments concerned, but Sir Henry considered that the work had been provisional, waiting for a central authority to take 'direct political responsibility for schemes', and for local authorities to administer them locally:

> ...Perhaps I may sum up the statement of our position by saying that we have provisionally carried on this work of organising educational endowments - a large part of the work of organising Secondary Education - to the best of our ability, so as to enable it to be inserted to the best advantage in its proper place in the larger framework of Secondary Education as a whole, as so that we may hand over the work in the highest state of efficiency to the coming Minister of Education.[65]

So the Charity Commissioner welcomed the transfer of educational responsibilities to a central body, and loss of power in this area. The same could not be said of the S.A.D.

Sir John Donnelly, it has been noted, had suggested to the Commission that the Department might take more notice of literary education in schools which were primarily science-orientated, sending a specialist at intervals to inspect progress. He was asked whether such a scheme pointed to the amalgamation of the Department with any other Departments, 'in order to become the central authority for secondary education'. He chose to interpret this as a reference to possible merger with the Charity Commission, and pointedly ignored promptings that he consider the Education Department, until pressed on this matter. For both bodies, in fact, he rejected the suggestion, putting faith instead on increased co-operation between separate institutions. As he stated, 'I do not see that there is any necessity for amalgamation. All that is necessary is that we should work together'.

But this could not be the case. The great weight of the reformist machine (or reactionary machine, to view it from a different perspective), as we have seen from these analyses of ideology, curriculum and organisation, was moving in a different direction, and the S.A.D., together with the curricular pattern which it represented, was becoming increasingly isolated. Its main error, in fact, was to assume, in public at least, that the rationale of the Commission was one of pursuing organisational efficiency when

it had just as much to do with ideological goals expressed through the status of schools, their curricula, and their clientele.

Report and Recommendations: (1) Ideology and Curriculum

The Report and Recommendations are as fundamentally concerned with ideological and curricular questions as they are with administrative organisation. Of interest is that they contain both descriptive and prescriptive elements - descriptive of the views propounded at length in the hearings, which were analysed in the first part of this chapter, but prescriptive in going beyond the hearings and positing a definition of secondary education which attempts reconciliation between the grammar school 'liberal' education, and the scientific and technical provision of the higher grade schools. The attempt is not a very successful one, being incompatible with current beliefs on the status of these two forms of schooling. Indeed, even within the Report itself, there are some contradictions and discrepancies in the way that the subject is handled, and subsequent events were to reinforce the distinction between the 'liberal' and the utilitarian, the literary and the technical, notwithstanding the interpretation that the Report tried to put on them. There is no doubt, however, that a desire for unity, and for a constructive solution to the chaos of secondary education (resembling the 'narrow streets and irregular buildings of an ancient town', according to *The Times*[66]), prompted a comprehensive attack on the problem - 'there appears throughout a desire to subordinate visionary and theoretical motives to what is entirely practicable, in order to smooth the way for immediate legislation'.[67] The difficulty was to be that no suitable and acceptable educational ideology was developed in the Report to

support the stipulative definitions of secondary education made. Without such an undertaking, attempts to promote organisational changes which were in any way based on this definition were likely to meet entrenched opposition which would be hard to overcome. This, in fact, was to prove the case.

Of the curricular points made in the Report, overwhelmingly the most numerous in the descriptive category are those concerned with the effect on school courses of S.A.D. activity and the use of the various technical funds. There are some fifteen specific, often major, references to the imbalance between the literary and the technical, and others to the role of the grammar schools as the guardians of the literary tradition and to the damage done to them by the technical expansion. Apart from a general account of the widening of the school curriculum nationally, and a further attempt by a Royal Commission to pin down a definition of technical education (inevitably as much prescriptive as descriptive), there is very little else of purely descriptive interest on curriculum in the Report. This brings across very clearly the overriding concern of both witnesses and Commissioners. The references are largely repetitious, and are scattered throughout the three parts of Volume 1, in which the main Reports and Recommendations are to be found. The following quotation provides the best summarising example of the stance taken:

The importance of preserving all grammar schools which are, or can be made, efficient, depends largely on the general ground that such schools represent especially the tradition of literary education. There is little danger at the present day that we shall fail to recognise the necessity of improving and extending scientific and technical instruction. It is less certain that we may not run some risk of a lop-sided development in education, in which the teaching of science, theoretical or applied, may so predominate as to entail comparative neglect of studies which are of less obvious and immediate utility, though not of less moment for the formation of mind and character. In efficient grammar schools, as existing examples prove, it is possible to harmonise modern requirements with the best elements of that older system which has produced good results in the past, and which in our own day still represents so much that is fundamental and indispensable in a properly liberal education....[68]

Despite this constant concern, the Commission was unable to ignore the necessity of maintaining and promoting scientific and technical teaching. There were constant reminders of Britain's relative economic decline. The Commission supported the desirability of a more comprehensive general education as a preparation for the specialised (literary as well as technical), and a greater balance in the secondary curriculum (the latter given substance in organisational recommendations). But this was not seen as a sufficient attack on the problem, and an attempt was made to win

over the hearts as well as the minds by proposing an integrative definition of secondary education to accord equality of status to the literary, the scientific and the technical - a definition then, as now, not commonly held unless one understands 'secondary education' in purely age terms. Before considering this attempt, we should look at the Commission's observations on the expansion of the advanced school curriculum, and the nature of technical education.

It is noticeable how difficult the Commission found it to draw a clear distinction between different levels and types of schooling. In particular, it noted that it was 'easier to draw a theoretical than to maintain a practical division' between elementary and secondary education, and that 'wherever the dividing line may be drawn, instruction has been so enlarged on both sides of it that whole regions of knowledge, at one time scarcely though of as falling within an educational curriculum, have been added to its province'.[69] It chronicled the rejuvenation of the classical languages and the rise of modern languages, the 'remarkable and growing use in education of certain physical sciences', and the dynamic, though unbalanced, expansion of the technical and the manual. The definition of technical education, however, caused the greatest difficulties. In fact, two definitions were posited, the first compatible with common usage with its practical, artisan connotations, the second somewhat strained in the desire to draw the technical under the heading secondary. Failure to make this distinction clear can lead to confusion in considering whether or

not the Commission made a good case for integrating the two concepts.

The primary definition is unexceptional in that it is the one used throughout the hearings by both witnesses and Commissioners. It recognises 'the idea of technical instruction as a means for the formation of citizens capable of producing wealth'.[70] In its recommendations on curriculum, the Commission later went on to expand this:

> ...full opportunities to boys and girls to prepare themselves for the particular occupations which they intend to follow in after-life, whether industrial or commercial, ought to be supplied by the teaching of the practical arts, such as the elements of applied mechanics and the subjects connected with agriculture, as well as of modern languages and of the kinds of knowledge most useful to the merchant or trader.[71]

The S.A.D. had demonstrated how many courses and subjects could be accommodated under the above headings - its liberal interpretation included 'the principles of banking and financial services; book-keeping; the principles of commerce; singing and musical notation; instrumental and orchestral music; political economy; seamanship; the science and art of teaching; veterinary science'.[72]

However, trying to subsume technical education under the heading secondary was a more difficult and controversial exercise. Both

Bryce, the Chairman, and Sadler, whose efforts had been largely instrumental in setting up the Commission, were committed supporters of unity in educational provisional. Both left their stamp on the Report. Bryce, as an Assistant Commissioner on the Taunton enquiry, had reported on Lancashire:

> Bryce emphasised the pressing need for educational co-ordination, and urged that any scheme for this purpose should be comprehensive and include universities and schools, boys' schools and girls' schools, elementary schools and secondary schools, as part of a single plan.[73]

Sadler had supported the idea of technical education as an extension of 'general education', rather than as an alternative to it. So far as general education itself was concerned, he felt that its character was too academic and divorced from the real world. He deplored the divisiveness of separating it from technical education. It is apparent that by general education he meant something akin to 'secondary education' as understood in the hearings. His work on university extension had convinced him that unmet demand existed from working people for a wide range of courses, the literary as much as the practical and scientific, a demand which made unreal the social distinctions between subjects. His position on this is summarised in this extract:

If general education is left to one set of authorities, and technical education is left entirely to another, there will arise a competition between them and finally a conflict of vested interests which will ultimately be deeply injurious to both. Rigid technical education, apart from the general principles of science and art, is likely to do more harm than good, by stereotyping present conditions instead of leaving the power of rapid and intelligent adaptation to our ever-changing conditions.[74]

These ideas, of integration both of the concept, and of the control, of secondary education, come through clearly in the Report. In conceptual terms, the Report tried to take 'education' beyond its conventional meaning and include within it the practical and the utilitarian:

> We are aware that there are some who would limit the term education to the discipline of faculty and the culture of character by means of the more humane or generous studies, and who would deny the name to instruction in those practical arts and sciences by means of which man becomes a craftsman or a bread-winner. But this is an impossible limitation as things now stand.[75]

It then went on to point out that particular studies associated with a 'liberal' education were often taught in a very restrictive manner - classics and literature teaching being cited. It does not

logically follow from this, however, that a better balanced literary provision, complemented by studies in mathematics and the sciences, would not have constituted a full education, nor that it is necessarily the case that education must include studies related directly to the world of work - that is, technical studies. But the Commission made great efforts to present a case for the inclusion of the literary, the scientific and the technical in its definition of secondary education. They were included not simply as types of schooling covering a similar age range, where secondary education would denote simply post-elementary provision, of whatever type. Rather, they were considered to share common features which made them equally educative - that is, contributory to the development of the 'whole man'. The notion, in particular, that the technical could be educative in the same way as the literary, or even the scientific, represented a departure from conventional usage, and certainly from the prevailing mood of the hearings. It represented the unique contribution of the Commission to the practical difficulties involved in reorganising post-elementary education, difficulties which were, as we have seen, as much ideological in their basis as they were organisational. We return to the assertion that change in the structure of education, if it is to be successfully carried through, may often require, as a necessary precondition, the development of a strong ideology. This fact was recognised by the Commission, which could, after all, have made a good enough case for reorganisation alone by citing the many instances of structural chaos brought to its attention in the hearings. But Sadler thought that the divorce of technical

education from the literary and scientific, in ideological terms quite as much as structural, would 'make a hateful and dangerous cleavage in society'.[76] It was necessary, therefore, to go beyond the descriptive and to enter the prescriptive field. The undertaking was based on two propositions:

1) that the definition of 'education' must be extended to the practical;
2) that the literary, the scientific and the technical shared common characteristics which made all three 'educative'.

The first proposition followed the stipulation that a true education should prepare the student for employment as much as for the 'good life'. This was not supported by any philosophical argument of weight. It is true that the remark was made that 'education inevitably becomes more and more practical', but it was as impermissible then, as now, to argue from what was the case, to what should be the case. The stipulative definition of 'secondary education' made was that it was 'a process of intellectual training and personal discipline conducted with special regard to the profession or trade to be followed'.[77] This followed from a more general definition of education:

> All education is development and discipline of faculty by the communication of knowledge, and whether the faculty be the eye and hand, or the reason and imagination, and whether the knowledge be of nature or art, of science or literature, if the knowledge be so communicated as to evoke and exercise and discipline faculty, the process is rightly termed education.[78]

The integrative force here is reference to faculty psychology, in which, it was believed, the brain was divided into different compartments, each controlling a specific mental function - for example, the 'memory faculty', and the 'reasoning faculty'. One trained the faculties with appropriate mental exercise. This psychological basis for the definition of education does not meet at any point the entirely philosophical notion that education concerns preparation for the 'good life', nor, indeed, that it should prepare for employment. As such, it had insufficient force to overcome entrenched ideological opposition. So far as combining the conventional idea of 'liberal' education with the criterion of practicality, appeal was made to the tenets of utilitarianism[79] - 'even culture is not an end in itself, it makes the private person of more value to society and to the State'.[80] This was a more respectable counter to the argument which put the 'liberal' on one side, and the practical on the other, but it was really too nebulous a concept to overcome the starkely real divisions in society and their associated prejudices. A further observation that 'every profession, even that of winning scholarships, is a craft, and all crafts are arts', represents unsubstantiated

rhetoric. However, it is on the basis of these points that it was asserted that 'no definition of technical instruction is possible that does not bring it under the head of secondary education, nor can secondary education be so defined as absolutely to exclude from it the idea of technical instruction'.[81]

That technical could be secondary was correct. other than in age terms, if one accepted the definition of secondary given (see[77]) - indeed, it was necessarily so, since a tautology was involved. That secondary was technical rested on an expanded definition of technical, involving the learning and application of *any* principles (it included the capacity, for example, to 'interpret a literature or a science...convince a jury or pursuade a senate...command an army'). But this second definition of technical went far beyond the earlier ones given (see[70] and [71]). This rather contrived edifice did not, in my opinion, present a very convincing reason for revising opinion about the relative statuses of different forms of educational provision. It must be said, moreover, that the Report itself presented inconsistencies in its approach - while labouring to subsume the technical in the secondary as an educative force, elsewhere it referred to the higher grade schools and the 'secondary education of a peculiar and limited character' that they had produced, and to a school where '12 take shorthand, 8 take German, and 20 take Latin - the mechanical subject, shorthand, being treated as an alternative to the really educational subjects'.[82]

In summary, the Commission was reluctant simply to present curricular reform proposals in the shape of remedial action to correct the undesirable effects of fragmented control and funding of secondary education, a course of action which was relatively uncontroversial given the widespread support which existed for structural change. It wished, in addition, to redefine the ideological content of the debate and to make a case for the recognition of the literary, the scientific and the technical as equally valid forms of secondary education. In organisational terms, its proposals were largely to be implemented. albeit in a piecemeal fashion, over the coming decade, but attempts to stipulate parity of esteem amongst the various components of post-elementary education were to fail. One is reminded of a comparable phenomenon after the secondary reorganisation following the 1944 Education Act. An educational ideology, more especially one which contains very strongly ascriptive elements, as was the case in the 1890s, cannot be modified to any significant extent by official report or legislative action, except insofar as legislation may change the objective conditions which nurture the ideology. This was not to occur after 1895.

(2) Organisation

The Commission's analysis covered the current pattern of control in secondary education, the considered effects of that pattern, and proposed remedies. Sufficient has been said, for the purposes of this chapter, about the structure of control. A more detailed analysis will be given later when policy-making in this field of public administration is considered in the light of organisational theory.[83] However, to serve as introduction to this later work, it is worthwhile briefly summarising the Commission's views on the defects of, and remedies for, the situation it had been investigating.

Condemnation of secondary education provision was comprehensive in scope and uncompromisingly frank. After making some prefatory remarks about the main organisations involved, at national and local level, and noting the lack of 'organic connection' between them, the Commission summarised the problem as it saw it. It is worth quoting these points in full:

> The growth has not been either continuous or coherent; i.e. it does not represent a series of logical or even connected sequences. Each one of the agencies whose origin has been described was called into being, not merely independently of the others, but with little or no regard for their existence. Each has remained in its working isolated and unconnected with the rest...This isolation and this independence, if they may

seem to witness to the rich variety of our educational life, and to the active spirit which pervades it, will nevertheless prepare the observer to expect the usual results of dispersed and unconnected forces; needless competition between the different agencies, and a frequent overlapping of effort, with much consequent waste of money, of time, and of labour.[84]

It is no surprise that the Commission later went on to conclude that a 'general survey of secondary education, as it now exists in England, appears to show that the first problems to be solved are those of organisation'. However, as I hope has been demonstrated, this statement should not be taken at face value, obscuring as it does the major curricular questions which were firmly linked to the structural.

Before summarising the proposed remedies, note should be taken of what the Commission felt it wished to see achieved. Again, later work will consider whether or not these aims could be said to have internal coherence, and be practically realisable given the nature of the reforms, so they are here presented with little comment. The main objective was seen to be 'to reconcile the ultimate unity of central control with a system sufficiently elastic to meet the almost infinite variety of local requirements'.[85] This bears, coincidentally, a marked resemblance to observations made before the hearings had begun.[86] The stipulation of shared responsibilities between central and local authorities is the most marked feature. Reference has been made to the importance of

preserving local initiative in reform, a concern which extended to curricular as well as organisational matters. The Commission shied away from prescription in curricular questions, beyond recommending the unification of the literary, the scientific and the technical as equally valid forms of secondary education. It wished to see the new authorities 'try experiments and profit by their results', and 'we hold it inadvisable to attempt to fetter their discretion by any rigid rules'. The role of the central authority was not made clear - it was to 'supervise the general interests of secondary education in England as a whole...while leaving due freedom of action to the local bodies'.

The reform proposals themselves contain no surprises, given the prevailing opinion during the taking of evidence. It was recommended that a central authority be constituted as a department of the executive, headed by a Minister. It should incorporate the existing Education Department, the S.A.D., and that part of the Charity Commission concerned with the oversight of secondary education - 'The policy of a Department is likely to possess more definiteness, and the power of carrying that policy out to be greater, than can be secured under the present arrangements'.[87] The Minister should also have responsibility for elementary education. Below this, there should be constituted local authorities for the provision of secondary education of the three types referred to and, to advise the Minister, an Educational Council. Further points were made about examinations, inspection, and other questions of educational administration.

This survey of the Bryce Report has been structured fairly conventionally. Comments and opinions have been taken from a variety of sources to illustrate the main preoccupations in the debate on late nineteenth century secondary education. The main integrative element identified has been ideology, which has given coherence to what has been said. Running through the hearings and Report is a view of society which gives particular strength to the whole affair. It parallels the major organisational concerns which have been noted, the two together giving the reform proposals their particular character. It is to the organisational aspect to this affair that we now turn.

REFERENCES

1. Kazamias, A.M., *Politics, Society and Secondary Education in England*, University of Pennsylvania Press 1966.
2. see page 25.
3. see, particularly, p. 165, and Chapter 3 *passim*.
4. quoted in Grier, L., *Achievement in Education - the Work of Michael Ernest Sadler 1885-1935*, Constable 1952, p.26.
5. see chapter 3, part (2)
6. see p. 14.
7. see pp. 168-169, and Chapter 4 *passim*.
8. *The Times*, March 2nd 1894, p. 8.
9. ibid.
10. *The Times*, March 7th 1894, p. 3.
11. ibid.
12. see *The Times* of November 1st 1895, p. 6.
13. For references to the composition and representative status of the Commission, see note 88 below.
14. *Report of the Royal Commission on Secondary Education* (hereafter *Bryce*), 1895, Volume 4 (*Minutes of Evidence*) p. 101.
15. *Bryce*, Volume 2 .(*Minutes of Evidence*), p. 114.
16. op.cit., p. 366.
17. op.cit., p. 448.
18. *Bryce*, Volume 3 (*Minutes of Evidence*), p. 56.
19. op.cit., p. 266.
20. *Bryce*, Volume 2, p. 360.

21. op.cit., pp. 367, 456

22. see pp. 97-104.

23. *Bryce*, Volume 2, p. 129.

24. *Bryce*, Volume 4, p. 270.

25. *Bryce*, Volume 2, p. 284.

26. op.cit., p. 131.

27. Musgrave, P. W. (ed.), *Sociology, History and Education*, Methuen 1970, Chapter 5.

28. *The Technical Instruction Act 1889*, Section 8.

29. see page 76.

30. refer to chapter 3, section 3, p. 175.

31. *Bryce*, Volume 3, p. 86.

32. ibid.

33. *Bryce*, Volume 3, p. 260.

34. op.cit., p. 48.

35. ibid.

36. op.cit., p. 54.

37. op.cit., p. 520.

38. op.cit., p. 17.

39. For analysis of the relationship between the 'work unit' and the larger organisation to which it is attached, see Chapter 3, pp. 127-129.

40. *Bryce*, Volume 3, p.202.

41. *Bryce*, Volume 4, p. 111.

42. ibid.

43. ibid.

44. *Bryce*, Volume 2, p. 126.

45. op.cit., pp. 119, 128.

46. *Bryce*, Volume 4, p. 511.

47. *Bryce*, Volume 2, p. 134.

48. Abney was a key figure during the reorganisation period surrounding the 1899 Board of Education Act. See Chapter 4 for a fuller discussion of his role.

49. *Bryce*, Volume 3, p. 531.

50. *Bryce*, Volume 2, p. 135.

51. op.cit. p. 134.

52. *Bryce*, Volume 3, p. 532.

53. The relative emphases to be determined within the newly constituted Board of Education became a major question in the period 1899-1900. See the discussion commencing on p. 259.

54. *Bryce*, Volume 3, p. 533.

55. *Bryce*, Volume 4, p. 523.

56. see p. 35.

57. *Bryce*, Volume 3, p. 6.

58. *Report of the Schools Inquiry Commission (the Taunton Report)*, 1868, Chapter 8, p. 658.

59. *Bryce*, Volume 3, p. 508.

60. op.cit., p. 520.

61 *Bryce*, Volume 3, p. 55.

62. op.cit., p. 4.

63. op.cit., p. 506. Kekewich was instrumental in 1899/1900 in pursuing the dismantling of the S.A.D, particularly through the medium of the *Walpole Committee on the Reorganisation of*

the Education Department and the S.A.D. See pp. 263 and 267, and Chapter 4 *passim.*

64. This promise was not to be fulfilled in a straightforward manner. The Secretary of the Charity Commission, Daniel Fearon, became in 1899 a member of Walpole Committee (see p. 287). He expressed at that time grave doubts on a new Board of Education's ability to master the technical intricacies of administering educational endowments. The matter of transferring Charity Commission powers was delayed beyond 1900.

65. *Bryce*, Volume 3, p. 469.

66. *The Times*, November 1st 1895, p. 7.

67. op.cit., p. 6.

68. *Bryce*, Volume 1, p. 48.

69. op.cit., p. 16.

70. ibid.

71. op.cit., p. 284.

72. op.cit., p. 28.

73. Dictionary of National Biography, 1922-1930.

74. Mackinder, J.H., Sadler, M.E., *University Extension, past, present and future*, Cassell 1893, quoted in Grier, op.cit., pp. 16,17.

75. *Bryce*, Volume 1, p. 135.

76. Grier. op.cit., p. 26.

77. *Bryce*, Volume 1, p. 136.

78. op.cit., p. 135.

79. For example:

...education and opinion, which have so vast a power over human character, should so use that power as to establish in the mind of every individual an indissoluble association between his own happiness and the good of the whole...

Mill. J.S., *Utilitarianism*, Fontana (1967 edition), p. 269.

80. *Bryce*, Volume 1, p. 136.

81. ibid.

82. op.cit., p. 73.

83. see, particularly, chapter 3 (4), p. 177 and after.

84. *Bryce*, Volume 1, pp. 17-18

85. op. cit. p. 65

86. see p. 37

87. *Bryce*, Volume 1, p. 259.

---

88. The composition of the Bryce Commission (*n.b. titles and designations given are as they were at the time of appointment*):

Rt. Hon. James Bryce (1838-1922), MP, Chairman of the Commission. He had a background as a brilliant scholar and academic, who entered Parliament as a Liberal in 1880. Assistant Commissioner (1865-6) on the Schools Inquiry Commission (*the Taunton Report*). Appointed Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster 1892 and President of the Board of Trade 1894, and in the latter capacity assumed the Chairmanship of the Secondary Education Commission.

Rt. Hon. Sir John T. Hibbert (1824-1908), MP. Bar 1849. Entered Parliament as Liberal in 1862. Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board (1871-74 and 1880-83); Under-Secretary at Home Office 1883-84; Financial Secretary to the Treasury (1884-5), and at the time of the Bryce Commission (1892-95). In addition to his involvement in national politics, he had become the Chairman of Lancashire County Council in 1890, and the first Chairman of the County Councils Association.

Mr Henry Hobhouse (1854-1937), MP. Bar 1880. Entered Parliament as Liberal in 1885, and became a Liberal Unionist in the following year. Prominent member of the National Association for the Promotion of Technical and Secondary Education (NAPTSE).[89] He was Chairman of the Somerset Technical Education Committee at the time of the Commission, went on to become Chairman of Somerset County Council in 1904, and served as Chairman of the County Councils Association from 1914-20.

Sir Hubert Llewellyn Smith (1864-1945). From a Quaker background, he became a civil servant of wide experience and significant responsibilities. Lecturer in the Oxford University Extension Delegacy and the Toynbee Trust (1887-88). Secretary - National Association for the Promotion of Technical and Secondary Education (1888-92). He became the first Labour Commissioner on the Board of Trade in 1893. At the time of the Commission he was a member of the Technical Education Committee of the London County Council.

Mr Richard C. Jebb (1841-1905), MP. Professor of Greek at Glasgow in 1875, and then at Cambridge in 1889. He entered Parliament as a Conservative in 1891. Appointed a member of the Consultative Committee of the Board of Education in 1900.

Mrs Eleanor M. Sidgwick (1845-1936). She helped to found Newnham College, Cambridge, and in 1892 became its Principal. Her main interests were in the higher education of women and in psychical research. She was the sister of Arthur Balfour, who was to become Prime Minister in 1902.

Mr Michael E. Sadler (1861-1943). Secretary to the Oxford University Extension Delegacy at the time of his appointment. In 1893 he organised the Oxford Conference on Secondary Education which led directly to the setting up of the Bryce Commission. Appointed to the research and advisory post within the Education Department of Director of the Office of Special Inquiries and Reports (1895-1903). He later pursued a distinguished career in academic and public life.

(see Bibliography)

Rev. Andrew M. Fairbairn (1838-1912). A religious thinker and writer. A Congregationalist with an interest in the reform and development of theological education in the free churches. He was Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford from 1886 to 1909.

Hon. and Rev. Edward Lyttelton (1855-1942). Headmaster of Haileybury (1890-1905), and of Eton from 1905. Chairman of the Council of the Teachers' Guild at the time of the Bryce Commission.

The Very Rev. Edward C. Maclure (1833-1906). Appointed Dean of Manchester 1890. Chairman of Manchester School Board 1891-1903. He later became Deputy Chairman of the Education Committee (1903-1906). Member of the Consultative Committee of the Board of Education from 1899. A governor of various educational establishments.

Mr. James H. Yoxall (1857-1925). A teacher by profession, he became General Secretary of the National Union of Elementary School Teachers in 1892. In 1895 he entered Parliament as a Liberal.

Sir Henry Roscoe (1833-1915). Professor of Chemistry at Owens College in 1857. He served as a member of the Royal Commission on Technical Instruction (*the Samuelson Report*) from 1882-84, and entered Parliament as a Liberal in 1885. A member of NAPTSE. He went on to become Vice-Chancellor of London University in 1896.

Dr. Sophie Bryant (1850-1922). Teacher at the North London Collegiate School for Girls when appointed to the Commission, and became its Headmistress in 1895. She went on to become a member of the Consultative Committee of the Board of Education from 1900 to 1911, a member of the Senate of the University of London (1900-07), and member of the London Education Committee (1908-14).

Dr. Richard Wormell (1838-1914). Headmaster of the London Central Foundation School (1874-1900), and Deputy Chairman of the Council of the College of Preceptors. He was the President of the Headmasters' Association from 1895-96.

Mr George J. Cockburn (1848-1927). Chairman of the Leeds School Board for 21 years until its abolition following the 1902 Education Act, and similarly Vice-President of the School Boards Association of England and Wales. He was a pioneer of the development of the higher grade school.

Lady Frederick Cavendish (1841-1926). A Lyttelton by birth, she was the sister-in-law of the Duke of Devonshire and niece of Gladstone. She had a particular interest in religious education.

Mr Charles Fenwick, MP (1850-1918). A miner and trade unionist who became an M.P. in 1885. P.C. 1911.

The representative status of the Commission members:

The County Councils - Hibbert, Hobhouse, Llewellyn Smith.

The school boards and elementary teachers

- Dean of Manchester, Cockburn, Yoxall.

Universities - Jebb, Sadler, Roscoe.

Schools - Lyttelton, Wormell

Criticisms voiced were that there were no representatives of grammar schools, and that the body was too large and unwieldy. Dr Bryant and Lady Cavendish were the first two women appointed to any Royal Commission.

(*these biographical and other notes were taken from the Dictionary of National Biography, 'Who was Who', the Europa*

Biographical Dictionary of British Women, and from The Times *of March 2nd 1894 and November 1st 1895*).

89. NAPTSE was in the forefront of the reform movement in secondary education. It had sponsored an unsuccessful bill in Parliament in 1892 to bring English secondary provision into line with that of Wales, whose local authorities had been granted powers to aid general secondary education under the Welsh Intermediate Education Act of 1889. As well as Hobhouse, Sir Henry Roscoe and Sir Hubert Llewellyn Smith were also members, and the Duke of Devonshire, who became President of the Council in Salisbury's 1895 administration and the political leader of the reform movement which culminated in the 1899 Board of Education Act and the 1902 Education Act, was President. See also Lilley, R.C., 'Attempts to implement the Bryce Commission's Recommendations - and the Consequences', *History of Education*, 1982, Vol. 11, No. 2, pp. 99-111.

Chapter 3

Organisation Theory and the Public Sector

It has been a major theme of this work that national curriculum change should be studied through the behaviour and activities of participating organisations - indeed, that otherwise the essential dynamic of the process of negotiation and conflict in the political and administrative arenas would be obscured. The last chapter considered the background to the developments in secondary education policy through analysis of the ideological, curricular and organisational dimensions of the Bryce hearings during 1894-95. This chapter will add the necessary perspective on organisations, with particular reference to the public sector and educational policy-making, which will enable us to look, subsequently, at the unfolding of events from a viewpoint different from that conventionally taken in discussing matters of political and administrative change. It will be sub-divided thus: (1) the internal structure of organisations; (2) the functions and purposes of organisations (with particular reference to those in education); (3) organisations and their environment; (4) politics and administration: the public sector organisation; (5) change and reorganisation.

(1)The internal structure of organisations

Organisations are, by definition, purposive bodies, and much prescriptive attention has been accorded to the relationships between structure and goals, in terms of the search for congruency between the disposition of members and the ends for which the organisation exists. This search for appropriate structure has progressed through a number of distinctive paradigms. One cannot say that each supersedes the previous model - rather, they reflect differing perspectives on the task and, most importantly, differing priorities in the valuation of human input against organisational output. The three approaches of scientific administration, human relations theory, and systems analysis, have dominated theory and practice, though it must be pointed out that they have been developed and popularised after the period in British public administration with which we are presently concerned. Their value lies, nevertheless, in the insights which they can provide, with hindsight, on the development of educational policy-making at the turn of the twentieth century. In particular, the principles of scientific administration, associated most closely, in chronological terms, with the period in question, will be found to correspond most with the practices then supported, although it has been stressed by others that the organisation of government departments in this country at that time drew little on any clearly-defined theory.[1]

Three theories of organisational life

Scientific administration as a basis for organisation in the private or public sphere draws its inspiration from the mechanistic notion that workers can and should be so disposed as to contribute most efficiently to the achievement of goals. The priority exhibited is the attainment of output, the end taking precedence in planning over the humanity of the labour input, except insofar as it becomes necessary to contain those impulses which may detract from goal achievement, and to accommodate and nurture those which are positively and safely useful. Control and co-ordination become the key tenets. Clear definition of tasks, and specialisation of labour, are accompanied by hierarchical patterns of command and communication, and a tightly drawn authority structure. Because, however, this structure allows little scope for initiative or innovation (being most appropriate to routine procedures and undisputed goals), there is the necessity to add various 'staff' positions, particularly at the top, to cater for forward planning and response to the unexpected. A conflict may exist between the pursuit of 'unity of command' through the strict definition of superior/subordinate relationships, and the need to adopt more open and flexible 'staff' positions.

This model is associated most closely with the classical bureaucratic structure developed by Weber.[2] A more detailed analysis of the concept of bureaucracy will be made later in this chapter.[3] Both scientific administration and bureaucracy are

directly relevant as explanatory tools in discussing the behaviour of the central organisations involved in secondary reform after Bryce. Self, for example, has stressed the military origin of much of the terminology used in conjunction with these concepts ('staff positions', 'unity of command', etc.),[4] and this is of particular interest in considering the Science and Art Department and the distinctive contributions made to its operations by the Royal Engineers Donnelly and Abney. The relationships between these general principles of organisation (developed largely outside Britain, by Gulick and Urwick, for example, in the United States, and Fayol in France) and the distinctly British contribution to the theory of public administration, will also be examined later in this chapter (see part 5).

Between the wars, the development of human relations theory shifted the emphasis away from goal attainment and the view of personnel as factor of production, towards a greater recognition of the needs and satisfactions of individuals within organisations, and the contribution which could be made to the achievement of goals if sufficient attention were paid to this human element in the disposition of personnel. It uncovered, also, the distinction between the formal statement of role and status relative to others, and the informal network of personal and work-orientated relationships which grows up in any organisation, and which may be as important as the formal in understanding organisational behaviour and making prescriptions for the pursuit of future tasks. Of later date, systems theory has also laid primary stress on the

organisation itself, rather than on output variables, seeing the former as an interlocking whole with its own 'needs' and rationale which may, or may not, correspond to the public definition of the organisation.. Hall et al see the advantage of the systems approach to the study of public administration as being that it 'corrects one of the side effects of emphasising policy-making; namely, the tendency to expect a high output of policies and to see blockages to new policies as pathological'.[5] Moreover:

> ...it does oblige us to look at the policy process through the eyes of the policy-maker; the person who has to work within and through the government machine. For him, the ability to block a policy may not indicate pathology but be a vital and necessary safeguard for the well-being of himself, his colleagues and the organisation of which he is a part. Demands made upon an organisation can be a source of stress.[6]

After the Board of Education Act of 1899, as both the organisational pattern of educational policy-making and the direction of secondary education itself, underwent radical modification, the systems approach will prove most useful in bringing out the change dynamic.

The three approaches mentioned are not alternatives in our study - rather, they provide complementary means of describing events. All three are concerned with organisational activity - that is, the mans by which ends are pursued by more or less rational means. The

emphases may be different, but none of the three can ignore the essential means/ends links:

> ...(they) share one important general characteristic. Their general concern is with problems of management, and their usual viewpoint is that of the manager...Thus modern management theorists can draw eclectically upon contributions from all three schools without running into inevitable contradictions.[7]

Approaches to the study of the administrative structure all focus, with variable emphasis, on what Self has identified as the two 'interlocking perspectives' of organisational life. These are, firstly, the pattern of control and co-ordination for task achievement exhibited within the organisation and, secondly, the range of functions pursued. If a particular function becomes the responsibility of more than one organisation within an administrative system, then one must also recognise that the links between the organisations concerned, their respective responsibilities within the relevant area, and the existing methods, if any, of mediating disputes and conflicts, become additional and necessary points for scrutiny. The question of organisational goals and functions will be treated in part 2 of this chapter, and that of overlapping roles in part 3, where it forms part of the discussion of the environment of the organisation, and also in part 5, where consideration is given to what may happen when the problems of inadequate co-ordination,

duplication, and lack of efficiency in pursuit of goals, are treated by the amalgamation of the relevant organisations. The objective, again, will be to make available analytical tools for discussion of the administrative pattern in secondary education described by Bryce, and the rationalisation proposals contained within the 1899 Board of Education Act.

Organisational structure

Of importance in a discussion of structure is the concept of technology, which refers to the methods used by management in pursuing goals. Self has observed that 'in the interests of efficiency, organisations wittingly or unwittingly attempt to maximise the congruence between their technology and their structure'. However, he also notes that such an attempt may be more or less successful, and that a useful starting point in the analysis of organisational behaviour lies in determining whether or not the technology is appropriate to the achievement of objectives. In fact, despite criticisms that study of formal structure is too restrictive and unsubtle in its treatment, Self advocates this approach initially, as most appropriate to an understanding of 'the intrinsic tensions or conflicts which arise within administration, such as those between specialisation and integration of tasks, or centralisation and decentralisation of decisions'. Perrow has produced an analytical scheme for this exercise, which considers a division of personnel into technical and supervisory functions, their respective degrees of discretion

and power, the basis on which intra-group co-ordination is made, and the degree of interdependence between the two strata.[8]

Another useful general perspective on structure is provided by Millett,[9] who considers the functional and hierarchical division of organisational groups within an administrative system. In his analysis, the primary body at the bottom of the hierarchy is the 'work unit', followed in ascending order by the managerial units whose function it is to co-ordinate the work units beneath, then specialist supervisory bodies and, finally, the highest level units whose function it is to monitor the environment and ensure organisational adaptation to it, in terms, for example, of relationships with other organisations, and forward planning. He observes that the discretion of the work unit is reduced by the activities of the units at other levels of the organisation, but that, nevertheless, it may maintain a rationale and sense of purpose which differ from theirs in more or less fundamental respects. This will give it a certain independence which may defy efforts to impose a particular line in its activities, especially if the nature of its work does admit of some degree of self-regulation. Self approaches this question in a different way by considering the differential commitment of personnel:

> ...the operators of some particular service, particularly those who are most directly performing it such as field workers, often have a commitment to the service which is not matched by controllers and co-ordinators. In particular, they

> may feel resentful and discouraged through the imposition of controls which reflect broader requirements of organisational maintenance and policy co-ordination.[10]

This analysis applies to all organisations, or parts of organisations, which are directly in touch with client groups in the public service, and is certainly relevant to the education service in a time of change, where certain bodies have developed a particularly close relationship and expertise with respect to certain functions, but are being asked to relinquish their position. Such, for example, was the condition of the Science and Art Department before and after 1899, and that of the school boards facing abolition proposals in 1902.

The school, pre-eminently, is the classic example of the work unit, the focal point of the supervisory and administrative structure lying about it. During the initial period of this study, the degree of independence of schools from the central authorities depended on the type of school involved. The higher grade school, as Bryce witnesses attested, was tied very much in curricular questions, as was the school board, to the necessity to satisfy the requirements of the Science and Art Department. The grammar school, whilst scarcely touched by the Education Department or the Science and Art Department, operated under a scheme whose modification required the participation of the Charity Commission. It had greater independence from central authority, largely because it did not receive, in general, the same grants as the higher grade

schools, and so did not receive such continuous scrutiny. Nevertheless, both types of school were able to enjoy, as individual units, some measure of uniqueness of contribution and sense of self-identity, precisely because they alone were immediately in contact with the clientele of the service, and because central monitoring, although rigorous in the case of the higher grade schools, could never be comprehensive and continuous.

These specific points are of interest, but not central to this study. Of more direct relevance in Millett's and Self's analyses is the abstracted point that within a hierarchical structure some units will exhibit a measure of autonomy from their titular superiors, perhaps because of the nature of the task, especially if it is of a technical or professional nature, or perhaps because higher level co-ordination is weak and spasmodic, or incapable of overcoming entrenched and habitual opposition to interference from above. The consequence of this will be a fragmentation of the administrative system and a lack of coherence in planning and achieving objectives - indeed, a clearly-defined, system-wide set may not exist if, by convention or otherwise, top-level control of subordinate bodies is restricted. This describes, in outline, the *status quo* at the time of Bryce - in fact, the very chaos in secondary education which stood in place of a rational system provided, it may be remembered, the motive for setting up the Commission. These points will be expanded upon in the next chapter, and part 5 of this will deal with the related topic of change where reform is prescribed for a deficient structure.

Bureaucratic organisations

Integral to a study of structure and public administration is the concept of bureaucracy, much used as a term of disapprobation in its association with 'red tape' and the inflexibility of officialdom. This derivative usage is linked with more precise formulations of the meaning of the term, of which there are three which are relevant. Firstly, there is the connotation of bureaucratic as synonymous with structured, in the sense of a system characterised by order. This is to focus attention on the essential feature in the second definition, which explores the concept in terms of routinised tasks, predictability of method, hierarchy of personnel, and other features which draw attention to a tightly-structured, goal-orientated body with authoritarian power lines. Thirdly, and with quite a different emphasis, there is the literal meaning of the word, as in 'rule by the bureau', or 'rule by officialdom'. This turns attention away from the internal workings of the bureaucracy, towards its relationships with other bodies in its environment, particularly other organisations, not least client groups and those providing political input to its policy deliberations. Of particular relevance in this study is the bureaucratic response to pressures for change in educational policy-making which came from pressure groups and other informed opinion, and through the political and legal impositions made on the departments. In terms of the analysis made by Salter and Tapper,[11] the bureaucratic response to change, as will be seen (part 5), constitutes an important element in the process of

redefinition of goals, and often, indeed, a countervailing one with respect to other inputs.

The concept of bureaucracy as structure is a recognition of the fact that structure itself implies coherence and order. Perrow uses it in this sense when he asserts:

> ...every organisation of any significant size is bureaucratised to some degree or, to put it differently, exhibits more or less stable patterns of behaviour based upon a structure of roles and specialised tasks. Bureaucracy, in this sense, is another word for structure.[12]

Salter and Tapper use the term in a wider context, although with essentially the same meaning, when they refer to bureaucratic pressures which are brought to bear during the process of change and adaptation, pressures which 'emerge...from the general need of modern society for rational modes of organising its increasingly complex system of social relationships'.[13]

The characterisation of bureaucracy in terms of its specific, as opposed to general, structural features, has received wide attention, both as a descriptive tool and as a prescriptive model in such theories as scientific administration. Weber's pioneering work in this field stressed the existence of a 'continuous purposive activity of a specified kind', with structured social relationships, a hierarchy of authority, functional division of

labour, and social boundaries.'[14] Weber was concerned with the positive aspects of bureaucratic organisation, and its adoption as a means of pursuing the goals of political authorities. Later writers on bureaucracy began to explore its dysfunctional aspects, just as the developers of human relations and systems theories had done in their analyses of the shortcomings of scientific administration. Nevertheless, they did not deny the basic structural components identified by Weber. Self makes specific mention of the smaller public administration of the last century, with which we are concerned, noting that 'the traditional norms of bureaucratic behaviour were related to a much smaller public sector, more effectively policed to check waste, and confined to a more limited and less flexible range of tasks'.'[15] Salter and Tapper, following Weber's analysis, identify some of major aspects of bureaucracy which contribute to its stability and strength:

> The permanence of bureaucracy is enhanced by its technical advantages (precision, speed, continuity etc.); the cult of the objective and indispensable expert; its hoarding and control of specialised knowledge; its use of secrecy to increase the superiority of the 'professionally informed'; and its general protective cloak of rational organisation and operation.'[16]

They note also that the bureaucratic organisation will pursue the goal of efficiency in operation through the use of 'routinised and predictable procedures'. This conception of the bureaucratic

structure as being most appropriate to the pursuit of clearly-defined goals through pre-determined methods, and therefore inappropriate to the treatment of the novel and the unexpected, is a clear line running through all discussion of this form of organisation, and a source of the dysfunctionalism identified in its operation. It will be appreciated that the Science and Art Department exhibited bureaucratic features in its methods and outlook, to the extent that it became very good, by its own criteria of performance, at fulfilling the functions which it had largely drawn up for itself. Its bureaucratic inertia prevented it from responding sufficiently quickly to the growing dissatisfaction with the kind of secondary education which it was sponsoring. Even the reforms which it unveiled during the Bryce hearings, to give literary education a greater prominence, were made in a bureaucratic manner, through formal revision of the subject directory system.

Perrow approaches the question of characterising bureaucratic or other organisations by proposing four areas for analysis: the degree of variability of stimuli; the nature of search procedures; the nature of the material that is to be processed; the task structure. The variability of stimuli refers to the degree to which the organisation is presented with the predictable and the familiar in its contact with its environment. A bureaucracy has stimuli which are largely invariable - that is, the world outside presents it with few surprises which might demand of it a novel or flexible response. The nature of the material, too, is relatively

uniform and stable. The term 'search procedures' refers to the method by which the member of the organisation has to 'search' for an appropriate response to a given stimulus. In Perrow's terms, a bureaucracy has 'analysable' search procedures - that is, they are routine and straightforward, requiring little initiative. 'Task structure' refers to the relationships between the supervisors of production and their superiors in the technical management level. In bureaucracy the supervisors have minimal discretion, since stimuli and responses are, respectively, predictable and routine, while the technical management has greater discretion in its control of the supervisors. Co-ordination within the supervisory group is pre-planned, while the technical group co-ordinates itself through feed-back techniques.

The points made about the internal functioning of a bureaucracy will be of use in discussing how and why the central organisations involved in the provision of secondary education responded to the demands made on them from outside. But, by itself, this will be insufficient, because it paints a picture of a body which is essentially passive in its dealings with external demands. The third definition cited above makes it clear that a bureaucratic organisation will, as a means of both safeguarding and furthering its own interests, seek to impose some dominance on the environment. In Britain, as Thomas has pointed out,[17] the constitutional role of the Civil Service has been to provide advice to Ministers and to propose policy alternatives, as well as to defend the Minister in a way which can only be considered to be

partisan. She sees a fusion of politics and administration, and a two-fold problem of bureaucracy in terms of the delay and caution which characterise such an institution, and the growth of official power through involvement in policy-making. Salter and Tapper, who, as we have seen, lay particular emphasis on the role that involved bureaucracies play in shaping the direction of change, go further than Thomas in reifying the organisation and ascribing independence of action to it:

> ...complex state bureaucracies (have) needs and minds of their own. For though it is naturally in the interests of major government bureaucracies to respond to the economic order on which their survival ultimately depends, they may also view their interests in terms of the maintenance and expansion of their own power.[18]

The last word on the rule of the bureau must go to Weber, who considered the basis for the extension of official power:

> Bureaucratic administration means fundamentally the exercise of control on the basis of knowledge. This is the feature of it which makes it specifically rational. This consists on the one hand in technical knowledge which, by itself, is sufficient to ensure it a position of extraordinary power. But in addition to this, bureaucratic organisations, or the the holders of power who make use of them, have the tendency to increase their power still further by the knowledge growing

> out of experience in service. For they acquire through the conduct of office a special knowledge of facts and have available a store of documentary material peculiar to themselves.[19]

The assertion here, quite simply, is that knowledge is power, and the maintenance of power therefore requires that access to power be controlled, not least through restricted recruitment of personnel. In Britain in the nineteenth century the Northcote-Trevelyan reforms, implemented after 1870, helped to bureaucratise the Civil Service by removing the worst excesses of nepotism in recruitment and replacing it with entry through competitive examination. Nevertheless, recruitment to those higher administrative positions which admitted of some independence and discretion was almost solely restricted, in the education service, to candidates with honours degrees from the two ancient universities. By closing, almost entirely, promotion from below, and thereby reserving to themselves access to, and development of, expertise, senior civil servants made themselves both powerful with respect to departmental clients, and indispensable with respect to the provision of service. Unless they themselves were subject to some rigorous degree of political control, however, there was the danger of insularity and lack of adaptability to environmental changes. Such was the case with the Science and Art Department.

Technocratic organisations

Self distinguishes between bureaucratic and technocratic organisations, the former 'governed closely by laws and rules, and...concerned usually with the enforcement of regulations or the provision of services of a fairly standardised nature...discretion is very limited, and is guided by detailed rules, not by professional or technical judgement'. The latter,, on the other hand, 'is concerned with more flexible services and tasks which require a considerable degree of professional or scientific discussion', and will have a 'more discretionary and particularistic interpretation of its goals'.[20] In addition, a technocratic agency 'is more likely to have a distinctive or assertive view-point, particularly if it is manned by a strong professional group dedicated to a certain view of agency goals'. The last point made is strongly descriptive of many government departments in the history of British public administration, not least the Science and Art Department in the period with which are concerned, as may be seen in the evidence given by Donnelly and, particularly, Abney, to the Bryce Commission. It may be, as has been implied, that bureaucratic constraints on the body of a department do not fall with equal force on the higher positions in the hierarchy, where responsibility lies for the conduct and direction of the organisation. The relative independence of these positions from the requirements of routine and predictable tasks will give discretion, to a greater or lesser degree, depending on the force of political imposition, to determine or influence the

ethos and functions of the organisation. In this respect, the top echelons of both the Education Department and the Science and Art Department exhibited technocratic, rather than simply bureaucratic, characteristics. In other words, they had a view of their role as civil servants, and of the place of their particular educational responsibilities in the life of the nation, which was more than simply a dedication to task achievement. They saw themselves as the professionals and the experts and, particularly in the case of the Science and Art Department, as the guardians of an orthodoxy. Thomas has commented on the ethical dimension in British public administration which gives a normative, rather than simply a pragmatic, force, to the actions of civil servants. This will be discussed at greater length in part 4.

The technocratic form of organisation presents distinct structural and operational differences from the bureaucratic. Within an organisation otherwise largely bureaucratic in behaviour, other non-bureaucratic units may also exist. In Self's terms, they do not occupy a central position, but rather one on the periphery - 'research units, special service units, and the like. They often do serve to deal with the unstable and uncontrollable environment, as contrasted to the more controllable production function'.[21] Their independence may be both a strength and a weakness. It will be a source of strength if it provides essential information, expertise, or some other service, to the leadership of the organisation. It will be a weakness if it makes too great a claim on scarce resources, or if it provides rivalry to the leadership of

the organisation and an alternative focus of public attention. Sadler's Office of Special Inquiries and Reports was such a unit, and Sadler resigned the post of Director in the face of professional and financial neglect from Morant, who had become the first Secretary to the Board of Education after a period as Sadler's assistant in the Office. It is tempting to see this as an example of a clash between the emergent leadership of a largely bureaucratised organisation, and the non-bureaucratic unit at its fringe. The question will be reconsidered later in this work.[22]

Communication and co-ordination

Within and between organisations, the quality of communications and co-ordination assumes a position of some significance in the search for rationality and efficiency in policy-making. Although there will almost invariably be some public expression of the goals and ethos of an organisation, it is certainly not the case that all members of the organisation will share this viewpoint to the same extent if, indeed, they share it at all. No assumption may be made that all members are pulling in the same direction. Public goals represent the face which the dominant elements wish to present, or which have been imposed on the organisation from outside - for example, in terms of statutory functions. This does not mean, however, that time will not see the emergence of a new dominant group which will modify goals. Individually, and by sub-groups, people bring to organisations interests, prejudices and outlooks which may reinforce, or detract from, a full commitment to

organisational methods and goals. For many, the organisation which employs them assumes a necessary place in their lives, but competes on unequal footing with other organisations for allegiance. Socialisation of employees into the norms of the organisation will be more or less successful, depending on the quality of recruitment methods and later handling of employees. The direct relevance of this is that an organisation divided internally against itself, where factionalism and conflict exist in pursuit of competing goals, will not be efficient when viewed from outside. The corollary of this is that an analysis which relies on a normative view of organisations,, rather than on a purely descriptive one, may see all dysfunctional activity as abnormal, whereas, in fact, it is a common feature of all organisations, differing only in type and extent. Self comments on the difficulty in determining where the common ground lies for decision-making in each organisation:

> ...empirical studies of behaviour show how utterly unrealistic is the notion of the members of an organisation sharing agreed decision premises or equal communication flows. On the contrary, the sociological and political barriers to unbiased collection and distribution of information have been increasingly demonstrated.[23]

Thomas has commented that formal co-ordination has been stressed less in British administrative thought than the broader concept of communication, but it is nevertheless true that discussion of the merits and demerits of the rationales and structures of differing

co-ordinating systems has featured widely in the literature on organisation theory, precisely in order to make some prescription on methods for dealing with the various centrifugal, disruptive, or simply uncommitted, elements within an organisation. Even to the extent that there is a general agreement as to goals, disagreement may exist as to methods, and intra-organisational rivalries based on some uniqueness of contribution or expertise. Hall, amongst others, stresses the importance of studying interdepartmental, as well as interpersonal, power relationships in order to understand the working of the institution.[24]

Although the necessity of finding a basis for co-ordination is not in doubt, it must be said that no one method will suit all circumstances. Different means will serve different structural circumstances and requirements. Self distinguishes three types of co-ordination - policy, resources, and technical - and the necessity of pursuing uniformity of administrative method, as reasons for promoting a centralisation of control. Policy co-ordination, for example, might be promoted through the activities of an 'overhead unit' which will oversee subordinate departments and agencies. It is axiomatic that it can only control if given the formal power to do so, or if it is able to assume such a position through the acquiescence of other bodies or through the usurpation of their formal powers. Lack of formal power, or steadfast preservation of some measure of independence of status and operation by inferior organisations, must produce some discontinuity and lack of effectiveness in policy co-ordination.

The Board of Education was given the overhead unit function with respect to secondary education - the effectiveness of the use of its formal and informal powers, and its ability, or otherwise, to co-ordinate policy, were not matters which could be assumed without question. Chapter 4 shows clearly that the development of a new institution, by amalgamation and reconstruction of existing bodies, is a process which derives its inspiration from a wide range of sources, not all of which, by any means, pull in the same direction or necessarily have the same motives.

The scheme above envisages co-ordination in terms of certain functional areas of organisational life, and is a response to a need for structuring according to specialisation of task. This can take place on either a lateral or a vertical plane, the former in response to functional specialisations which will require that each relevant level of the organisation has its representative body, the latter where, for example. particular functions become the responsibility of one tier rather than another, such as in the provision of certain services by a higher level body to those beneath it.[25] With respect to the primary function of goal determination, Self identifies and advocates either a 'positive' or 'negative' hierarchy, with each recognising a different locus of goal determination:

If goals can be clearly and successfully articulated from the top downwards, then a system of 'positive' hierarchy seems desirable, i.e. one where firm instructions move on down the line. If meaningful articulation of goals occurs at lower levels and the upper echelons perform only a role of organisational co-ordination, then a 'negative' hierarchy seems desirable, that is one concerned primarily with the arbitration of conflicts...[26]

The normal pattern in nineteenth century departments, certainly in those under consideration in this study, was of the 'positive' hierarchy' typical of a bureacratic institution. The relative simplicity of public administration compared with modern times, its narrower scope and greater paternalism of outlook, lent themselves to an authoritarian structure and greater degree of routine in tasks. A proliferation of specialist agencies within departments, and a breakdown of 'positive hierarchy', both features of an organisation facing increasingly complex and novel demands, and dealing with them in a co-operative rather than a bureaucratic manner, was not a general feature of this period.[27]

When considering control and co-ordination, the concepts of 'span of control', and 'staff and line', become relevant. Both concern the relationships within the organisation between personnel at different positions in the hierarchy. 'Span of control' refers to the number of subordinates controlled by a superior, while the concepts of 'staff and line', whilst variously defined, are taken

most commonly to refer, respectively, to those positions concerned with control, planning and policy-making, and those of inferior status involved in the execution of of lower-level, more routine tasks. The optimal span of control will depend on the task in hand - the greater the routineness and predictability, that is, the more bureaucratic the organisation, the larger the span of control may be - in other words, one may efficiently control many. On the other hand, the greater is the element of uncertainty in the operation, the smaller should the span be, to allow for a tighter supervision and an element of co-operation. It may be necessary to change the span to accommodate changing circumstances. A tightly-structured, bureaucratic organisation may administer effectively during periods of relative stability, but be inappropriate to a time of change, when new demands are being made on the administration. Indeed, the utility of a fixed span of control, with all that this implies in terms of superior and subordinate, may be called into question entirely during periods of rapid change, when a much looser 'organismic' structure may be more appropriate. These points will be reconsidered when facing the question of whether the central education departments, both before and after 1899, were adequately structured to deal with the challenges facing them. An attempt will be made to define the organisations in terms of 'staff and line' criteria in order to assess the degree of compatibility between structure and goals.

Power and authority

A final word should be said about the use of power and authority in administrative organisations, where power represents the ability to get things done regardless of the wishes of those who are being imposed upon, whilst authority recognises the legitimacy of orders and directives from above, and of the positions from which these are issued. Studies indicate that the more professional the organisation is as a whole, the less effective it is to use either coercion or reward as a basis for motivation. Conversely, these will be more effective in a less professional, more bureaucratic structure. Perrow has observed that workers not under constant scrutiny may be brought under some degree of check by circumscribing their discretion with rules, or by 'professionalising' them, which means to bring them to identify the organisation's interests as their own. Warren has identified the most functional bases for control in a professional organisation as legitimate power (or authority), expert power, and referent power.[28] Expert power refers to the acceptance of orders on the basis of recognition of competence and expertise, while in referent power 'a power recipient identifies with a power holder and tries to behave like him'. It is crucial, in terms of the promotion of effective action, to ensure that the appropriate type of control structure is imposed. In terms of policy-making, which is what this study is ultimately concerned with, it will be most important to ensure that higher level personnel are treated in a manner most appropriate to their status and self-image if initiative and

adaptability are to be encouraged. Too tight a control of these people, and control of an inappropriate kind, may be dysfunctional for an organisation which needs to be responsive to environmental pressures if it is to retain credibility. As a matter of fact, government departments must accept the rigours of public accountability and show some measure of adaptability if they are to survive.[29]

(2) The functions and purposes of organisations (with particular reference to those in education)

It has been taken as axiomatic that all organisations are purposive. The direction and strength of purpose may be variable over the range of organisations. So much depends upon the structure of the organisation concerned, and upon the functions it undertakes and the goals which it is asked to pursue. In the first section of this chapter the internal structure of organisations was considered. Congruency between structure and purpose is essential if functions are to be fulfilled, and goals attained, with any degree of efficiency. That this ideal may not be realised is an indicator of poor, or inappropriate, managerial style, or the presence of factors, internal or external to the organisation, which are diverting it from its goals. As examples of external influences in the sphere of public administration, one may quote political interference, or an inadequate level of resource allocation. The political input, indeed, may not be strictly external to the body, in the sense of originating outside the central administrative system, but may come via the presiding minister, whose appointment may not be linked primarily to proven managerial expertise. The political factor is a source of some instability in the life of public organisations, and inconsistency in their performance, and may be responsible, in addition, for a further cause of problems, that of unclear or contradictory goals. Continuity, such as exists, is most often provided by the permanent, bureaucratic elements, which may come into conflict with

the political.[30] The concept of the 'departmental view' is not mythology. Kekewich's account of Gorst's contribution to departmental administration illustrates the point, in its condemnation of arbitrariness and unprofessionalism.[31]

The functions and goals of educational organisations may only be understood within the context of the functions of the educational system as a whole. It would be unexceptional to say that the system has a social function - that is, that its development is tied in with the interests of society as a whole. But this is, in fact, an observation which has a relatively modern currency. The 1870 Education Act gave statutory backing, and therefore parliamentary approval, to the first attempts to build a system as such on comprehensive lines, and extended in scope over the following century. Forster, introducing the Bill to the House of Commons, gave three explicit reasons why a national system of elementary education should be developed, the public effort to supplement the voluntary:

> We must not delay. Upon the speedy provision of elementary education depends our industrial prosperity. It is of no use trying to give technical education to our artisans without elementary education...Upon this speedy provision depends also, I fully believe, the good, the safe working of our educational system. To its honour, Parliament has lately decided that England shall in future be governed by popular government...but now that we have given them political power

we must not wait any longer to give them education...Upon this speedy provision depends also our national power...if we are to hold our position...we must make up the smallness of our numbers by increasing the intellectual force of the individual.[32]

However, as we saw in the chapter on the Bryce Report, a commitment to a national system did not imply a commitment to equality of social or occupational status. Within the general social function which was linked with the life of the nation as a whole we find the more specific social functions associated with the maintenance of class barriers and the demarcation of employment areas. Indeed, the latter, more specific functions predated the former, more general one, and they have persisted with great tenacity.

THroughout Bryce run the twin currents of concern - for the national interest, but also for the maintenance of the social order.

Salter and Tapper summarise the functions of the educational system as those of social control, the training and credentialling of manpower, the pursuit of 'citizenship in a mass democracy', and 'idealistic considerations concerning the welfare of the individual'. For these authors, the education system constitutes 'the critical institution in the social control function of the state because it can help to produce and to legitimise patterns of social inequality and mobility'.[33] In addition, it serves to socialise people into the 'authority patterns that are part of the

social relations of production'. Whilst not wishing to go all the way with the authors in their neo-Marxist analysis (they profess themselves avowedly non-Marxist), it does seem to me to be fundamentally the case that discussions of educational reform do raise the questions of social status and the distribution of social and economic power as matters of some concern to those involved, regardless of the pressing needs of the 'national interest'. The public announcement of reform proposals may not, however, refer to these points. Forster's speech, quoted above, does not, nor do the Bryce proposals lay emphasis on them, though it has been shown how much they preoccupied the Commission and its witnesses. We come back, in fact, to the central part that ideology plays in the negotiation and articulation of reform proposals in education.

Ideology and reform

For Salter and Tapper, the content of educational ideology has four components - it contains some conception of the social order as a whole, which it supports and articulates; it portrays the desired 'product', expressed in terms of a distribution of social types; it contains some conception of human nature; it sets out how the education system can be used to further the desired ends. In

summary:

...the objective of these four components is to be able to legitimise, either singly or in varying combinations, the power of a group, its aspirations for more power if it has them, the political order it prefers and the inequalities associated with that order.[34]

Paulston, too, reminds us of the 'central influence of ideology and power in attempts to alter values and structures in educational systems',[35] and criticizes many change studies for neglecting these factors.

Before leaving these general points about the purposes of the educational system, it is worth drawing together, briefly at this time, two strands of thought on educational policy-making. Firstly, that of the significance of ideological considerations in this particular area of public policy compared with others, but that of the necessity, secondly, of mediating proposals through bureaucratic organisations whose own internal structures and values will have a more or less marked impact on the reforms as actually executed. These points, and their relevance to the present area of study, will be taken up again in greater detail as we examine the implementation of reform after Bryce. It is worth noting, however, Self's observation that the concept of efficiency in administration is always relative to the interests concerned with the outcome of departmental work. Each of these interests has a legitimate part to play in the development of policy, and each solution will be, to a lesser or greater extent, a compromise of forces:

This circumstance is often lost upon participants and some theoreticians - for example...the correct controlling principle of all administrative organisation is sometimes held to be the purpose of political leaders; whereas this is to look at the system from only one perspective which, however important, is also transitory.[36]

Only by considering the impact of all relevant bodies in a pluralistic system will we come to a fuller understanding of why a policy took a particular form. It was undoubtedly the case that bureaucratic input to policy-making in secondary education was every bit as important in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as was political contribution via government and interest groups.[37]

Functions

The functions of organisations may be considered in two ways. Firstly, one can examine the internal division of the organisation's work according to the demarcation which exists, to use Perrow's categorisation, between production, research and marketing. Secondly, one can look outside the organisation to identify the functional basis for structuring the organisation as a whole. Haldane[38] suggested that work could be allocated according either to the classes of persons served, or to the type of services to be provided, while Gulick[39] extended this list to encompass area, client, process and purpose.

With respect to the first connotation of function, Perrow's categories are most obviously applicable to industrial or commercial organisations. Nevertheless, government departments are deemed to produce services for public consumption which, whilst not sold in the market-place, may be identified and valued. The various central departments with which we are concerned in this study produced a variety of services in the sphere of education, largely through their operation on organisations outside themselves. Their provision of services was, therefore, of a largely indirect impact, taking the form of regulation, supervision, funding, and the communication and dissemination of ideas. Perrow notes that production tends to be of a predictable, and therefore routine, nature, and certainly the regulatory and financing activities of the education departments appeared highly bureaucratised.[40] Research functions, on the other hand, require a different approach, and may be in conflict with the production function with respect to rationale and values:

> ...production is likely to have highly specialised sub-units, clear lines of authority, precise rules and procedures. Research, at the other extreme, may depend more upon lateral and diagonal communication among its members (and) there may...be few binding rules or procedures. It may be difficult for members of these two departments to work together, or even to communicate information easily, because of their different 'styles'.[41]

The production function provided the predominant rationale for the education departments. They were pre-eminently practitioners, not theoreticians, none more so than the Science and Art Department. Research, taken in its broadest sense as the collection of information, served the production function, as in the feed-back from inspectors on the impact of measures. Research of a wider, less immediately utilitarian nature tended to be outside the mainstream of organisational life, and to be associated either with individuals, such as Arnold or Sadler, or with bodies outside the departments - the various Royal Commissions forming the most obvious examples. Morant moved from research to production after leaving Sadler's Office of Special Inquiries and Reports to become Secretary to the Board of Education. The resulting split between the two men may have owed something to Morant's changing role and the different perspective and 'style' associated with it.

The concept of 'marketing' as an organisational function is not one which can usually be applied with any degree of success to public sector bodies which do not produce goods or services for sale. This is even more the case when the body holds a monopoly or semi-monopoly position with regards to clients, as it is then under little obligation to place itself in the position of supplicant. 'Public relations' activities are perhaps the nearest one can expect such an organisation to get with respect to marketing. In the case of the Science and Art Department, as we have seen, statutory controls expressed through the media of inspection, grant distribution and the curriculum directory, placed it in a powerful

and independent position *vis-à-vis* clients, allowing it to concentrate activities in the 'production area'.

Turning now to the second perspective on function referred to above, it is apparent that, whereas all service-providing organisations have, with various degrees of emphasis, production, research and marketing roles, it is not the case that they all equally have area, client, process and purpose orientations. The latter represent functional bases for structuring the work of the organisation which have partial, or total, exclusivity from each other. Taking each in turn: area refers to a geographic division of the department's work - that is, it is structured to deal with the needs of a specified part of the country, whatever the spread of those needs might be; client orientation has a particular and identifiable group of people as its focus; process as a basis takes advantage of specialisms and expertise in making and administering policy - it is a concentration on unity in method, on means rather than ends; purpose, finally, refers to the major goals of the organisation, but it is a term which has ambiguities in usage, and possible overlap with the first three functional bases mentioned - the emphasis is, clearly, on the nature of the services produced, an emphasis on ends, rather than means.

British public administration tends to be structured on the purpose principle according to particular functional fields, although it is sometimes difficult to identify exactly what the major goals are - for example, in the modern Home Office or Department of the

Environment. The provision of education services appears a readily identifiable and assignable purpose, but both at the present time, and at the turn of the century, we find it spread amongst a number of departments and agencies, frequently on the client principle. Thus the Education Department concerned itself largely with elementary schoolchildren, the S.A.D. with those older; the D.E.S. has general supervision of the education service, but in practice much current initiative for the needs of a particular client group has been transferred to the Department of Employment and the Manpower Services Commission. The division of functions may follow no careful enunciation of principles, but be, typically, *ad hoc* incrementalism, with its attendant risks of duplication, incoherence of strategy, interdepartmental rivalry and weakness of political control. The provision of education services as a major function of public administration begs many questions of organisation.

Self makes the observation that sometimes a major purpose may be identified by which the 'orderly structuring of goals is facilitated', but that this is not the usual state of affairs, and purposes do not typically come in 'neat, tidy and reasonably durable packets'. Paradoxically, in terms of what has been said above, he considers education 'relatively self-contained in terms of its distinctive purposes, processes and clienteles'. Certainly, late nineteenth century educational goals were relatively clear-cut in terms of the content and clientele concerned, but this did not necessarily imply, of course, that the education service was so

structured as to take advantage of this fact. Bryce was important as a marker, both of the prevailing educational ideology and of the structure of the education service. Clarification of purpose led inevitably to prescription on organisation, it being clear that the chaotic state that the central departments found themselves in was incompatible with any thorough-going reform of the system.

Organisational change was purpose-led, but strong overtones of client and process considerations (the latter a distinctive feature of civil service involvement), were also present, and were strongly to affect the direction and structure of the change.

Goals

More specific than the macro-variables of function and purpose is the concept of goals, taken in the sense of discrete and relatively self-contained expressions of organisational activity. Perrow has characterised these goals as societal, output, system, product and derived. These will be defined here in terms of the education service. Firstly, societal goals, as the term implies, refers to the interests of society as a whole. The provision of state educational services is, indeed, the classical expression of societal goals, in its concern for literacy, numeracy, the transmission of cultural values, as so forth. As has been mentioned before, the question is begged as to whether, in practice, particular sections of society benefit more than others from the actual provision which gives expression to these goals.

Nevertheless, the general emphasis is clear - the goal is national in scope, and achievable outside the organisation itself.

Output goals refer to those which are determined in terms of the output of the organisation and associated client needs. The output of the central organisations in this study was the flow of educational services which were provided to enable subordinated organisations to meet the needs of the final recipient in a way which reflected the balance between the national policy, local discretion, and the views both of the central organisations themselves and of the various involved pressure groups. Output goals are of particular importance in educational discussion, partly because of the frequent difficulties in formulating them in sufficiently concrete form to enable successful planning and execution to take place, and partly because a change in output goals in education can have far-reaching structural implications for the organisations making the provision. Bryce highlighted the conflict in output goals in secondary education which was taking place at the time, also the fragmented way in which such goals as existed were actually pursued. The goal conflict itself concerned the competing, and mutually incompatible, conceptions of schooling represented by the liberal and utilitarian traditions, the former embodied in the grammar school model and the latter in the higher grade schools, particularly those of organised science. Moreover, not only did a goal conflict exist, but it was felt that the S.A.D. had produced a distorted and undesirable pattern, the more utilitarian offering, and was, moreover, beyond democratic control.

Ideological considerations forced a revision of output goals after Bryce, in terms both of a downgrading of the utilitarian and a restructuring of the central organisations themselves.

A point with which we must concern ourselves is the derivation of these various goals. They must, naturally, be generated either within the relevant organisations, or outside them. The required accountability of public agencies implies that the focus of goal determination should lie with the legislature and executive, and not with the permanent officials of the organisation itself. But herein lies the paradox of public administration. The nature of the political input, and the structure and operation of departments, are such that continuity and expertise are more likely to be found within the organisations than outside, and the departments, therefore, may be much better placed to develop and pursue goals then their political heads. Self comments on goal determination and the political process:

> ...the concept of orderly goal-setting still presents great difficulties in government. In democracies the formal leaders of public organisations are usually elected politicians. Most of these politicians are untrained in managerial methods, but in any case the conditions of politics do not favour systematic goal-setting. The political process provides an input of numerous demands which are frequently contradictory or inconsistent, while political attitudes are often vague and ambivalent. In order to manage conflict and maintain an

adequate coalition of support, political leaders must be wary of systematic policy-making and often confine themselves to vague aspirations until specific decisions must be made. The theorists, who recommend an orderly distinction of policy and administration, with politicians settling the broad issues and officials filling in the details, are at odds with the nature of political behaviour which is marked by an intermittently strong interest in detailed cases and frequent vagueness over policy.[42]

This is not to imply that all political input is capricious and in some way detached from the 'real' business of the department, nor that the enduring pattern of organisational purpose is attributable only to the activities of the officials. But we can say that the opportunity to take a long-term view and plan systematically will, on balance, lie more with officials than with politicians, especially when political control is weak, since vacuums in the exercise of power are rapidly filled by the more consistently single-minded.

One judges whether or not output goals have been achieved in public administration by reference to the department's success, or lack of it, in fulfilling its obligations to client groups with which it is associated. In contrast, an organisation will also have system goals, which refer to the desired state of operation of the organisation itself, rather than to its client-related functions. System goals may be looked at in two ways - Pitt and Smith[43] link

them directly with the external work of the department, defining them with reference to the 'internal state of the organisation, the methods and working practices which have been adopted to accomplish output objectives', while Self refers to such desirable organisational objectives as stability, growth, centralisation and innovation, pursued for their own sake rather than as instruments for output goal achievement. With respect to the Pitt and Smith formulation, there need be no conflict between output and system goals - indeed, the latter, by definition, are pursued precisely to expedite the achievement of the former. With Self's definition, however, conflict is possible, and even likely, as attention is focused on the inward-looking system goals to the detriment of the output goals whose pursuit gives formal and public legitimacy to the department's work.

The bureaucratic form can produce rigidities of operation which may themselves assume the status of goals - a departmental 'style' may develop whose maintenance assumes sufficient importance as to impinge on the pursuit of output goals, possibly with detrimental effects. An operational inertia may develop if the department is not subject to frequent administration of inputs from outside which are capable of keeping its attention focused on the output goals sponsored by government politicians. The danger is that a department allowed to gain a degree of independence of action may develop output and system goals which may prove unpalatable to critics, a state of affairs which may only be redressed by sharp action. Such action could take a variety of forms, but will be

distinguished by the imposition of corrective measures from outside as attempts are made to bring the department back under a firmer political control. In extreme cases, and if other relevant circumstances point to such a move, the department may be abolished and its functions transferred elsewhere. This happened with the S.A.D., which was associated both with a semi-autonomous development of a type of educational provision which many found threateningly undesirable, and with participation in an education service characterised by chaos. The Education Department was not seen to suffer the first defect, but only the second, and received comparatively little criticism for its role. It is the case, unfortunately, that amalgamations *per se* may not be the answer to problems with which organisations are associated separately, since a division may continue to exist, with the same, or similar personnel, within the newly-formed body. Such was certainly the case in the early period of the Board of Education, until the advantages of rationalisation could be better realised under the stronger unifying hand of Morant.[44]

With respect to the education service, and in particular to the S.A.D., the importance of product goals and 'distinctive competence' comes to the fore. Product goals refer to the pursuit, or maintenance, of desirable characteristics of the organisation's product. In public administration, the quality of the service provided is probably the single most important product goal, though though cost-effectiveness and instrumental value will also be characteristics actively pursued. It is not cynical to state that

a further product goal will be the development of those features of the service which reflect favourably on the department. Here we come to the issue of 'distinctive competence', which refers to what the organisation is considered to be, or considers itself to be, particularly good at. The S.A.D. evidence to Bryce indicated a pride in the development of a well-run and distinctive public service which contributed directly to a furtherance of the public interest. Its departmental product goals, and enthusiasm for the development of distinctive competence, were not, however, universally held, as we have seen.

Derived goals, finally, refer to the transference of organisational power gained in the pursuit of other goals, to further aims which may have nothing directly in common with the organisation's publicly accepted functions. To quote Perrow: 'Organisations generate considerable power which they may use in consistent ways to influence their own members and the environment. This power is used independently of product goals or system goals'.[45] This type of goal tends not to be a distinctive feature of the education system, which is particularly output and product goal orientated, but one might find in the behaviour of the S.A.D. not simply a zeal to provide a particular type and quality of secondary education, but also to use the considerable power generated by its monopoly position to promote more widely this model as a legitimate contribution to the needs of the nation.

The foregoing comments on goals may lead one to assume that their derivation and articulation by the organisation are as systematic as an analysis of them must be. This is far from the case. Perrow speaks of them as 'the product of a variety of influences, some of them enduring and some fairly transient', while Self comments that 'the distinctive attitudes of an agency can be seen as the product of accumulated experience and tradition, created by familiarity with a particular set of tasks and problems, and influenced perhaps by the personalities of leading administrators'.[46] These provide good summaries of the nature of goal-definition in the British education service. Policy-making, too, the means by which goals are translated into actions and results, is similarly subject to a variety of influences which makes identification of sources problematic. Operative factors include the extent to which the organisation interprets its role actively or passively, the degree of internal cohesion or conflict which exists (cohesion often being associated with dominant personalities), and the degree of independence, or lack of it, which may be assumed in the pursuit of goals. The problem is compounded when policy-making in a particular field is shared amongst two or more bodies, and conflicting opinions on both goals and methods exist. In terms of this study, the conflict which arose between the Education Department and the S.A.D. may be traced fundamentally to a lack of clearly articulated public policy on the development of secondary education by the politicians whose constitutional function it was to determine priorities in the broader sweep of policy. By default, the policy was carried forward by the body best placed to

do so, the S.A.D., while the Education Department remained bound by the strictures which prevented its involvement beyond Standard 7.

As a generalisation, if resolution of conflict cannot be made within the existing institutional arrangements, then three possible lines of development may be followed.[47] If a single issue is involved, a central control may be temporarily established and the problem dealt with on an *ad hoc* basis. A wider-ranging policy conflict may be dealt with similarly, in the sense of an imposition of control, but the stipulated relationships may be of a more permanent character. This solution could not be applied to solve the problems with which we have been concerned, as no administrative 'room' existed above the Education Department and the S.A.D. which might be filled by a new body. In addition, and more importantly, both these bodies were entrenched in their respective spheres of influence, and it would have taken something more than a new and untried body to dislodge them. The only practical remedy lay in integration under new leadership, for there was a pressing necessity to break down the organisational boundaries between the two bodies. This was a process of reform by disintegration and reorganisation, and it provided the only way forward.

(3) Organisations and their environment

The official purpose of public sector administrative organisations lies outside the organisations themselves, in that they are charged with functions whose fulfilment finds expression in the wider sphere of national life. Whilst not subject to the pressing constraints of the market-place in their operations, in the sense of a need to promote their activities in the face of active competition, to set prices and to make an acceptable return, they are nevertheless subject both to external constraints and to an accountability which runs upwards to the political heads of the departments and outwards to the general public which is served. Whilst the internal workings of such bodies, and of the individuals within them, may be closed and secretive, final actions must necessarily be open to scrutiny and comment. Furthermore, while the departments must contend with pressure for accountability from two directions, the public has the constitutional right to demand that both civil servants and politicians pursue the national interest in a responsible manner. This right extends not just to an *ex post facto* calling to account, but also to the input of ideas, suggestions and demands to political and administrative policy-making. Constant exposure to the environment at all stages of policy formation is the norm with administrative departments, which can react in various ways to influences which may be either constraining or liberating for the organisation. The formation of the Board of Education owed as much to external pressure for reform

as it did to internal recognition of the need for reorganisation - indeed, it will be remembered that the S.A.D. actively opposed it.

The organisation set

A concept which is useful when considering environmental impact and organisational response is that of the 'organisation set', which denotes those bodies whose existence and purpose complement the 'focal organisation' one is concerned with. Pitt and Smith have defined this concept in the public sector:

> The immediate environment of an organisation such as a government department is likely to consist of other organisations. A focal organisation...may be said to interact with its 'organisation set'. Part of this set will be predominantly concerned with the inputs to be processed by the focal organisation. In the case of a government department, the organisations in this sector of the environment will include Parliament (providing authority and funds), the Cabinet (providing new policies, strategies and objectives) and pressure groups (bargaining with expertise, co-operation and other resources valued by the department). On the output side will be those organisations which the department hopes to change in some desired direction...[48]

They go on to observe that the output component with government departments will often consist of social groups rather than

organisations as such. In our present study, it is a mixture of the two, the provision of secondary education being necessarily confined to an identifiable age-group (although ambiguities in the use of the term made distinguishing students by curriculum or type of school problematic), but provided at the local level through the activities of school boards (and later county councils) and schools.

Although identification of the organisational components of the organisation set is relatively straightforward, the provision of educational services must bring into play various cultural influences which are more difficult to pin down, yet vitally important in providing the atmosphere of approbation or disapprobation within which the departments work. Informed opinion, expressed most commonly through the leadership of pressure groups, such as teacher unions and local government units, plays some part in articulating cultural values, albeit tempered with the partisan views of the group itself. Popular opinion, however, is a more nebulous concept, less easy to ascertain but necessary to know when a department is dealing with matters of direct concern to a large section of the population. The enfranchisements of the nineteenth century and the growth in number and influence of cultural and social groups, provided greater scope for the expression of popular opinion, although, as now, much remained inarticulated, a hidden yet powerful undercurrent which departments and politicians might ignore at their peril. In the case of secondary education, two questions were prominent. The first

concerned the growth of the S.A.D. sponsored scientific and technical provision at the expense of the more literary, grammar school model, with the interests associated with the latter fighting something of a rearguard action with those now benefitting from a more advanced education for their children where previously little or nothing had been available. The S.A.D. responded to the newly advantaged but distanced itself from the grammar school supporters, a development for which it was to pay with its existence after Bryce. The second question was the inevitable one of funding, it being by no means clear what degree of financial imposition would be acceptable, at local level particularly, to provide for expansion of the secondary system.

Environmental values

Pitt and Smith note the problems inherent in trying to disentangle the various environmental influences on departmental policy-making, whether they be economic, political, legal, cultural, or whatever. They do, however, identify the salient feature of the environment, which is the 'normative quality of the environment'. By this they mean that the environment makes demands on the departments and provides legitimacy for their activities, provided they remain within the guidelines of what is acceptable. Lack of congruency between departmental behaviour and environmental demands may lead to a 'redefinition of the situation', as Musgrave has suggested[43] (see section 5). Pitt and Smith suggest that 'the most illuminating way of studying the organisational environments of

government departments is to think of them as a system of values operationalised through institutions',[50] which impose 'rules' to govern the departments' workings. The values which environmental interests, at either input or output levels, require departments to observe, are those of consultation in policy-making, legality in operation, efficiency, accountability, reasonableness and fairness. These provide constraints on action. Indeed, modern commentators such as Hoskyns, presently Director-General of the Institute of Directors and former Head of the Downing Street Policy Unit between 1979 and 1983, have observed that the requirements of accountability inevitably bring to the civil service a conservative, safety-first attitude to administration - what Pitt and Smith call the 'bureau-pathological traits of timidity, rigidity, and delay in decision-making'. Be that as it may, the essential point to be gleaned from these observations is that departments do not work in a vacuum - if they diverge too greatly from the dominant influences in their environment, they will be brought back into line in a more or less drastic manner.

Controlling the environment

A common defensive, or simply prudential, reaction by organisations whose activities are subject to constant environmental pressure is to try to deflect, or even neutralise, this pressure by taking steps to manipulate or control threatening elements. The constant goal is the maintenance of legitimacy, and the pursuit of 'organisational interest', which partly manifests itself in a

public body in its 'natural tendency...to manipulate or stabilise its environment, and to increase its resources and support'.[51] Perrow concentrates his attention on those organisational responses which 'make it possible to deal with the environment on a routine, predictable basis'. He cites the importance of various functional devices:

> ...the bureaucratic model refers to an organisation which attempts to control extra-organisational influences...through the creation of specialised (staff) positions and through such rules and devices as regulations and categorisation.[52]

Both the Education Department and the S.A.D., in common with other government departments, imposed some degree of control over their client environment through regulations, inspection, specification of subjects and the distribution of grants. The degree of influence over curriculum exercised by the S.A.D. has been referred to, and the relative worsening of the grammar schools' position attests to the strength of the S.A.D. in isolating a particular area of educational development and using what amounted to virtual monopoly powers to consolidate its influence. So long as its directive powers remained undiminished, and its standing was unthreatened by a competing body, it was able to maintain a tight grip on its environment, at least so far as the output side was concerned. Its vulnerability, however, lay on the input side. That is to say, it was unable, in the end, to forestall the threat to its operations which came from informed opinion and which was to

result in statutory changes by means of Cabinet and Parliamentary action. In political terms, its status *vis-à-vis* client groups was as much one of power as one of authority, in the sense that they were obliged, by the nature of the relationship, to accept its dominance. It was not a relationship of willing subordination so much as one of necessity. But it was stable, and the balance of advantage lay with the department. Client groups could not directly attack its dominance, but only indirectly via those groups and individuals influential on the output side of its environment. The Bryce hearings provided a public example of this process at work, a process which led through to the 1899 Act and beyond. The S.A.D. found few friends willing to argue for its continued independence, as the regime which it had pursued had effectively precluded it from defending itself from attack by 'co-optation', that is, by bringing threatening groups into its own organisation and inducing them to identify their own interests with its. However, there is a case for arguing that, although the S.A.D. was unable, in the last analysis, to take advantage of the benefits of co-optation, the reforming powers did employ an essentially similar stratagem to overcome its opposition to change, by forcibly integrating it into a new body, the Board of Education.[53] Initially, the changes were more apparent than real, but gradually, unified leadership took secondary education in a direction different from that which the S.A.D. had pursued, and the latter (or, rather, what the latter had become within the Board of Education), of necessity became identified with the new policies.

Competition and conflict

Perrow has observed that, 'to any organisation, the most important segment of the environment is other organisations, particularly organisations of competitors and customers'.[54] Mention has been made of customers, or rather clients, of the education service, and their position relative to it. Of importance also was the relationship between the two main agencies responsible for the provision of those services, the Education Department and the S.A.D., each forming part of the administrative environment of the other. Self makes a distinction between competition and conflict:

> Administrative competition shades into conflict as these relationships between agencies become more direct and intense. Administrative conflict also arises frequently between agencies who share powers for the performance of some service. In this case, any difference of viewpoint will lead directly to administrative friction and conflict, whereas competition occurs as a more indirect relationship between agencies who in principle have separate jurisdictions and programmes.[55]

The distinction drawn here between shared and separate functions, and between conflict and competition, is not so easily drawn in the case of the departments with which we are concerned. Both might have operated within the same school, to the extent that it worked beyond Standard 7, the Education Department taking responsibility for elementary instruction and the S.A.D. for more advanced

schooling. In this respect, they shared in the provision of educational services for a particular school or locality. On the other hand, they provided separate services within the total package. The sharing, insofar as it may be called so, was a forced and unnatural creature, depending for its existence on the movement of the S.A.D. into an area from which the Education Department was statutorily banned. The separate functions were a source of conflict rather than competition, based as they were on no unified plan, but on the pursuit of administrative advantage. Why the state of affairs resulting in this conflict should have come about is an important question. Self suggests two likely possibilities, both of which have relevance here.[56] Firstly, 'the frequent inconsistency or vagueness of public policy goals'. As we saw earlier, the output of the party political process is often at variance with the requirements of consistency in administration. There is no doubt that, in the late nineteenth century, there was no clearly-developed system of secondary education, nor even an approach to such a question in a serious manner until Sadler's Oxford Conference, and the Royal Commission, stimulated debate and action. It was a mixture of traditionalism and *ad hoc* incrementalism whose very arbitrariness was a source of friction. This leads us on to the second possibility, that a 'conflict of aims may be recognised politically but be deliberately remitted to the administrative process for solution'. There is some truth in this viewpoint, although it implies a more positive intention than did, in fact, exist.[57] Nearer to the mark would be to say that lack of clear policy existed for a long-term development of

secondary education, and administrative solutions of a partial nature were allowed to continue until such time as they cold no longer be defended in the face of growing opposition. This was a very inefficient solution.

The S.A.D. and its environment

In addition, Self identifies three main factors which maximise the chances of a department being able to exercise a good measure of independence. In each case, it will be seen that the S.A.D. conformed to these criteria to an appreciable extent, and this helps to explain why it was able to assume the dominant position which it did relative to the Education Department in the development of advanced, school-based education. The conditions are that there should be 'a real abnegation of government policy control'; that there exist 'a task or tasks which can be treated in relative isolation from the rest of government'; and that there should be 'an adequate and independent source of revenue'.[58] With some qualifications on the last condition, the S.A.D. was able to proceed on the basis of a good degree of administrative autonomy in a specialised area which was isolated from other areas of educational policy-making, and in which it alone, with the exception of the fragmented grammar schools, possessed expertise.

Ultimately, both the education service at central level, and its local environment, were redefined by statute. A rather abrupt public change brought to an end a period of disorder. This

question of change and reorganisation is an important one in its own right, and will be dealt with in the last section. It is worth repeating, at this point, the truism that the most important elements in an organisation's environment are other organisations, which react with it in generally predictable ways. As was asserted in the introduction to this work, curriculum is 'constructed by people for a purpose, almost invariably through the medium of organisations which interact with other organisations during the construction process'.[59]

(4) Politics and administration: the public sector organisation

Writers have commented on the relative neglect of political factors in analysis of change in public policy and public organisations.[60] The last section touched on the importance of party political input as a mediating influence between the environment generally and the departments concerned. It has a necessary role to play in redefining goals and moving monolithic structures in different directions. By itself, however, the concept of party politics cannot encompass the totality of political factors at work in the field of public administration. It is, moreover, simplistic to assume a straightforward relationship of the 'politician proposes, civil servant disposes' type, except in formal, constitutional terms. The reality of power relationships between the two groups, so often the key to understanding the dynamics of change, is subtler, depending both on the nature of the political input, in terms of clarity, consistency, popular backing, and so on, and on the department's reaction to such input, which will be governed partly by prevailing circumstances, and partly by the ethos of the department with regard to such questions generally, an ethos which it will probably share with other departments as part of a civil service 'view' of its position *vis-à-vis* the government. It is to these matters that we now turn.

The term 'political' may be applied in two main ways to discussion of the administrative process. Firstly, it may be used to denote input to the process, in various forms, by those bodies or

individuals associated with particular views on policy questions and a willingness and desire to expound and defend those views and have them put into practice, frequently in opposition to the views of competing groups. In the wider environment, this will refer generally to the activities of the parties, Parliament, pressure groups, the media, and the various other forms of popular and informed opinion, all of which provide a context within which the departments operate and receive legitimacy. More specifically and immediately, it refers to the policy input and oversight functions of the ruling party and government, and their agent the departmental minister. Secondly, it may refer to the department's own response to these external influences, insofar as it may be said to be capable of reacting in a 'political' manner. Such usage contradicts the accepted constitutional view of the role of the departments, but is consistent with one which recognises that they can, and will, develop and promote those interests which safeguard their own existence and influence in the administrative process. This second usage sees the departments as protagonists in the political struggle over policy, and not simply as the passive recipients of decisions made elsewhere.

If we consider both applications of 'political' to have validity in a discussion of the administrative process, it must be true to say that the public pronouncement of policy intentions follows a sequence of 'political negotiation' involving both environmental input and departmental reaction. This is not to imply that expressed intentions will necessarily be conflict-free nor, indeed,

that implemented policy will be, since the 'negotiations' which take place may not resolve all differences of opinion, nor overcome the tensions inherent in a situation where departmental ministers insist on exercising their constitutional 'right' to dictate the direction of change while faced with a bureaucratic structure equally cognisant of a 'departmental view' based on knowledge, expertise and traditional practice in the policy area concerned.

Administrative politics

The picture drawn above of political activity is not meant to imply a necessary similarity between the methods and motives of party politicians, and of bureaucrats. Although their interaction on policy questions may be considered 'political', there are essential differences in the standpoints from which they operate. Linking the two is the concept of 'administrative politics', which Self defines as 'relating administration to its political environment'.[61] For him, there is a necessary connection between the amount of political discretion that a department can exercise and the degree of independence of action accorded to it by the government, or allowed to it, in that both would tend to increase, or decrease, together:

> Administrative politics revolve around the discretionary decisions of administrative agencies or departments...(it) enters the scene wherever the formal structure is indeterminate or uncertain...(and) is also concerned with changing or bending the rules of formal structure.[62]

One might ask why the government should allow such a situation to develop, if the inevitable result is a diminution of its control. The answer must lie in recognition that the government cannot govern except through the administrative structure. It must acknowledge that structure's knowledge and expertise. The complexity of policy questions necessitates the department being granted some independence of action in formulating advice and implementing proposals. In addition, as we have seen, the government may remit decisions to the administrative process where it finds itself unable to give clear policy direction. The development of the various strands of secondary education, until the reforms of 1899 and 1902, was of this nature.

Civil service and government

Both Self, and Salter and Tapper, have comments to make on the development of administrative power relative to the government and party politicians. Self considers the conflict which may exist between the demands for polycentrism in policy formulation, and the need for policy co-ordination:

The effect of increasing agency autonomy will be to weaken general political control in favour either of professional control or sectional influence, or of some mixture of these elements. Policy co-ordination will be weakened by more agency autonomy to the extent that the agency's function is or ought to be linked with some other function...[63]

The main points made here, that agency autonomy and political control are inversely related, and that independence of action will weaken policy co-ordination where the agency should really be collaborating on policy with another agency, or agencies, encapsulates the situation in secondary education up to the reforms. The professional control in the S.A.D. developed in line with that department's relative independence of close party political direction, and the lack of emergence of a co-ordinated policy on secondary education is symptomatic of the fragmentation amongst various bodies of the powers which did exist to influence change in this policy area. A unified approach could not be achieved until these administrative defects were eliminated. This is not to imply that reform was easily imposed. Bureaucratic power and developed administrative practices provide a considerable degree of inertia which might best be overcome by outright abolition rather than by attempts to merge or reform. However, as we have seen, the apparently decisive act of abolition may exist, in reality, more in appearance than in fact, as civil servants are redeployed, often in large groups, to similar posts in the 'new' department, taking with them, to a large extent, their previous

outlook and experience of the policy area.[64] Resocialisation to new norms, such as can be imposed, is by no means an easy process. Self is quite clear about the magnitude of the task:

> ...entrenched organisational power can only be overcome by a very strong movement of political opinion that perhaps can only be activated by some catastrophe.[65]

Again, we find echoes here of the late nineteenth century position. The power of the S.A.D. was overcome and, although 'catastrophe' is, perhaps, too strong a word to use, there is no doubt, as Bryce shows, that there was a very strong political tide flowing in favour of reform, a movement associated with deeply-held perceptions of the defects of the existing arrangements. Against this tide, the S.A.D. could not marshall an effective public resistance. It turned instead to minimising the loss of its separate identity within the Board of Education.

Salter and Tapper are in agreement with Self over the efficacy of a strongly expressed party political viewpoint, in that 'if the political commitment of a government to a particular policy is high then it is unlikely to be resisted',[66] but they are dismissive of the general impact of the governing party on the policy-making process, which they consider department-orientated. Again echoing Self, they associate continuity, knowledge and expertise with the administration, but involvement of a spasmodic and essentially ineffectual nature on the part of politicians. They consider the

departments to be best placed to 'initiate and orchestrate the discussions which will lead to the formulation of educational goals',[67] since they control the administrative processes through which policy emerges, is evaluated, and is finally disseminated. The impact of the politicians, meanwhile, is often at the margin, supportive of a process over which they do not exercise full control:

> The input of the politicians, whatever their formal powers may be, consists essentially of providing general rhetorical support for the inevitable logic of the policy-making process. They simply lack the skills, time, resources and inclination to involve themselves in working out the detailed implications of demographic trends or what it means in specific educational terms to set new goals for schooling. If they hold office, it is the civil servants[68] who do this for them.[69]

The accepted constitutional role of the civil service, since the reforms of the 1870s, has entailed willing accession to the political will of the government. The views which have just been put forward indicate that the reality of the situation is somewhat more subtle. The political will of the government of the day, often unclearly and inconsistently expressed, may be an unequal opponent in the struggle for the practical dominance of policy, when faced with a structure whose essentially bureaucratic traits stress continuity, stability and predictability in its sphere of operations.

The conclusion to be drawn from this is that it may require an exceptional expression of political will to make significant impact on policy direction or departmental practice. Certainly, this lesson of history is not lost on the Thatcher government of the 1980s, which has taken some radical steps in an attempt to shake the civil service into a more flexible, imaginative mould. The problem which will be very difficult to overcome is that it is rather easier to get the civil service to change policy direction (and this is difficult enough) than to get it to modify internal practices, for the latter are at the every heart of the administrative machine. One cannot get away from the fact that the administration of government policy, if not its formulation, will always be a bureaucratic activity if equitable treatment and fair distribution are desired features of the system, since these can only be guaranteed by carefully regulated procedures which seek to eliminate arbitrariness in the execution of a department's work. There is a basic incompatibility between the political will for change, and bureaucratic resistance to change, and it is frequently the latter which prevails.

Group politics

It was noted above that the political dimensions of administrative practice were to be found on both the input and the output side - that is to say, they refer both to external influences on the work of departments, and to the departments' response and challenge to such influences. It has been a theme of this work that the study

of policy formation is to a large extent the study of organisational interaction, and this is not more clearly demonstrated than in the relationships which develop between central departments of state and those bodies surrounding them which wish to direct them, to influence them, or to receive benefits from them. Self identifies this pattern in terms of 'group politics'. He does not identify groups exactly with organisations, but asserts that they 'belong and work through formal organisations', and that 'group and organisational interests interlock':

> Group politics in administration takes two forms. First there are the variously co-operative or competitive relations between administrative and political groups; for example the relations between specialists providing some service and their client group, and those between generalist administrators and political leaders. Secondly there are the relationships between different public service groups, particularly in respect of balances of authority, influence and numbers.[70]

Reference was made earlier in this section to the lack of a 'necessary similarity between the methods and motives of party politicians and bureaucrats'. Differences in approach reflect differing purposes and preoccupations, so that, although it would be correct to assume that the relationships between departments and external political groups are likely to have some direct bearing on policy-making, it would be incorrect to assume that such

relationships are similar to those which might obtain between external groups themselves in the struggle for influence. This dissimilarity arises from the needs of the political groups to be responsive to the interests which sustain them, a process which, whilst constraining, allows a degree of flexibility and discretion, while administrative organisations' freedom of action may be more tightly circumscribed by the need to perform required tasks and organise along given lines:

> Administrative politics...operates within highly regulated and routinised guidelines when compared with the intrinsic fluidity of the political process. Whilst administrative organisations and groups (sometimes in conjunction) act as well-defined protagonists in some situations, they do not provide satisfactory counters for a general pluralist model of power politics.[71]

This does not imply that departments or agencies are disadvantaged as participants in the policy-making process. The particular nature of their participation is also the source of their strength, for with them lies the central role of turning political aspirations into practical proposals, and of executing policy once promulgated. The predictability and certainty of the methods used is a source of strength and control rather than weakness. That outcomes may be safe rather than imaginative is witness to the efficacy of the process.

Of related interest is the question of organising departments for the achievement of objectives. Again, one may distinguish the preoccupations of party politicians from those of officials:

> The political approach is concerned with the rules of accountability and the control of administrative power. The managerial approach is concerned with the rules for effective work organisation and task performance. The two approaches meet in a concern with the structure of formal authority, but otherwise cover different ground.[72]

Administrative politics and education reform

This distinction enables us to throw some light on the reform of secondary education. The proposals made had both politically and managerially prescriptive elements, in that, for example, the amalgamation of the various bodies concerned with secondary education was taken both to increase the scope for central control and to make for a tighter accountability (the latter, most clearly, by terminating the S.A.D.'s independent existence), and to make the provision from the centre more efficient and more consistent in its application. These two elements give us, therefore, criteria for judging whether, firstly, the reform plans appeared capable of achieving the stated aims and, secondly, whether the implemented proposals did, in fact, move English education in the desired direction. However, to state the question like this is to make some implicit assumptions, not least about the inherent

compatibility, or otherwise, of the political and managerial motives for the reforms. For example, the politically desirable goal of more unified central control may not necessarily have been the best way to achieve greater managerial efficiency of educational provision in a system which was, by its nature, localised and composed of discrete operational units, if by efficiency one might mean, amongst other things, that the schools should mobilise resources in the best possible way to meet not just national objectives for the education service but also the particular interests of the communities which they served. There may be incompatibility, also, between the two political aims of more unified central control, and greater accountability. The reformers had to demonstrate that the system was being brought firmly under the control of the government and Parliament, and made a step in this direction with the 1899 Act. This was to provide a more clearly-defined accountability to the elected representatives of the people at Westminster, but the centralising impulse (in part, managerially motivated), which was taken a step further with the establishment of the counties as local education authorities in 1902, produced, paradoxically, a reduction in local accountability as responsibility for the schools passed from the school boards. In fact, the reforms fell between two stools, attempting a clearer central 'supervision' while holding back from imposing a central curriculum. This paradoxical combination can be traced partly to the lack of clear policy and supervision which allowed the S.A.D. to dominate the provision of technical and scientific education and promote it as a valid definition of secondary education. The

reaction to S.A.D. dominance as an individual organisation was to unify at the centre, while the reaction to the hegemony of the Directory was to relax central control. The effects of this ambivalence of approach are with us still today.[73]

Administrative principles in Britain

Mention has been frequently made in this work of the behaviour of the departments as organisations, exhibiting certain traits which may be identified with reference to the findings of works within this field. However, insufficient has been said about the specific development and ethos of the British civil service class which was to be found in these departments. It is important to do so, since the way in which departments participate in the policy-making process will be heavily influenced by the view the civil servants have of their own role and functions. For example, of direct relevance today is the debate over whether they should maintain the Northcote-Trevelyan principles of permanence, neutrality and anonymity, or whether, as in the United States, a certain class of civil servant should be recognised which should come and go with governments and which should be expected to pursue partisan policies on behalf of ministers.[74]

A comprehensive comparative study of the principles of British and American public administration has been made by Thomas.[75] The main distinction which she makes in their respective developments concerns the position taken by both politics and administration in

the process of government, which she sees as separate functions in the American model, but somewhat fused in the British. In the United States the early development of the civil service owed much to the doctrine of scientific administration, which divorced politics from administrative practice and sought to pursue the latter as a science with clear and predictable means-ends links and principles of operation. Only later was this model to be tempered by the softening of human relations theory. The British model, by contrast, saw no such fundamental separation, but rather a blurring of the politics/administration functions which owed, and still owes, much to the direct and intimate policy-making relationship between the top career officials and their ministers. This is absent from the American system with its interpretation of tiers of politically committed appointees.whose role it is to give the lead on policy to the career officials and to motivate their efforts in the desired direction. In Britain it has been the role of the civil servant not simply to offer advice, but also to point out to ministers the political implications of courses of action which are remitted to them for appraisal, for the parliamentary system of government makes ministers subject to the scrutiny of the legislature, and the government as a whole accountable to the electorate, in ways which are quite different from that to be found in a presidential system with its separately elected and legitimised legislature and executive.

The implications for Thomas of this fusion of political and administrative processes was that the work of officials assumed a

qualitative, not merely a quantitative, aspect, as ethical considerations informed their deliberations. A search for a science of administration in the American model became a search for a philosophy of administration in Britain. From the beginning of the century, more rigorous thought was given to the enunciation of scientific principles as a basis for organisation (drawn together in the acronym SLOCUS - staff and line, organisation, communication, span of control),[76] complemented by specific strands of 'ethical idealism' which stressed the active participation of the civil service in the amelioration of social conditions and the furtherance of the national interest. Acceptance of this viewpoint throws further light on the relationships between the organisations which feature in this study, departmental forewardness in the area of secondary education being seen as a natural consequence of the pursuit of desirable change, in ethical terms quite as much as the result of the typical organisational impulse to maintain and improve position relative to other organisations.

This section has indicated that, in Britain, it is simplistic to assume that the political sphere and the administrative sphere are separate. Not only do departments themselves act politically with respect to their organisational environment, they also have constitutional functions and a self-view which takes them firmly into the area of party politics. To see them as otherwise is to ascribe too mechanistic and passive a view to their activities, and to judge a more active participation in policy-making as aberrant,

rather than as a natural consequence of their organisational and cultural characteristics.

(5) Change and reorganisation

This study is concerned fundamentally with the description and explanation of change in an organisational context. Analysis of the internal structure of organisations, their functions and purposes, and of the environmental influences which affect them, go some way towards providing these. It is necessary, however, to draw together points from each of these analyses to get an adequate explanation of the change process in public administration involving wholesale reappraisal of the purpose and existence of the institutions themselves. Institution-wide change accompanying restatement of the national policy aims is a frequent response by government to political pressures for action, or to the perceived failure of a discredited system, which may amount to the same thing. Such change, in reality, may owe more to the need to be seen to be taking initiatives than to any calculated plan born of careful and disinterested deliberation. As was mentioned in the last section, political input to departmental functioning may be disruptively unpredictable, a recognition of the frequent divergences of political and bureaucratic motivations. Indeed, the clash of interests between these two groups is a distinguishing feature of their relationship, giving the lie to the willing constitutional subordination of the administrative branch of the governmental to the political. This is not to imply a deliberately subversive intent on the part of the civil service. Rather, it is a recognition of the logic of the bureaucratic organisation, which stresses stability, continuity, and set procedure, in contrast to

the political influences whose impact is often felt at the margin. The bureaucratic reaction will be correspondingly stronger as the political interference takes hold of an organisation which has become accustomed to a greater measure of independence in its operations. Some general points about the features of such change, in the context of late nineteenth century educational reform, is the subject of this section.

There are various components of the change process with which we are concerned: firstly, the situation which obtains prior to the change initiative, which will include description of those factors which provoke the initiative; secondly, the change itself, by which is meant the time period during which major policy statements are made and institutional reconstruction undertaken; thirdly, the post-trauma period during which participants assess their new formal positions and formulate their reactions to the events which they have either set in train, or been subjected to. Such a division has a greater significance for analysis, perhaps, than it does as a descriptive tool for the actual unfolding of events, for it implies a discreteness of situation which oversimplifies the actual process. What may seduce us into this form of thinking is, as so often may be the case, the punctuation of occurrences through formal and public statements - that is, for example, government pronouncements of new policy aims, statutory abolition and reconstruction of organisations, the appointment of new political and administrative heads, the delegation of new powers, and so on. These may hide from the observer the true passage of events on two

accounts. Firstly, the apparently discrete hides considerable overlap in the three stages of the change process outlined above. For example, anticipation of change, and the organisational reaction to what is expected, or suspected, may precede by some margin the formal modifications which are later made. Indeed, the latter may, in many ways, be considered the culmination of the change process, not the initiation of it. Anticipation of change of a nature detrimental to the organisation concerned, and the defensiveness and obstructiveness which may accompany it, are more likely to be a feature of a system which conducts debate on such matters in the public forum and which allows the forces of pluralism scope for expression. The Bryce hearings, as the typical expression of such debate, had anticipatory effect on all of the future reorganisation candidates, as our discussion on them has indicated. Secondly, it is worth reiterating that the formal changes themselves are not necessarily an accurate guide to the actual change process which is occurring, but rather may be a prescriptive statement of statutory desirability which may, or may not, be achieved exactly as intended, even where the intent is clearly and unambiguously stated, which is by no means always the case. In neither the 1902 nor the 1944 Education Acts, for example, was the relationships between the central government, local government and the schools clarified to the extent that no doubt existed as to their respective powers in the provision of schooling.

The nature of the change process

With these qualifications in mind, some observations may be made on the change process. It would be useful, firstly, to consider the reasons why major change should be proposed, and what the typical institutional components of such change might be. Writers are generally agreed that change of a non-evolutionary nature - that is, which is imposed politically and which involves significant organisational and policy modifications - arises from dissatisfaction with existing arrangements, which are seen to be failing to achieve results in line with the aspirations of the government currently in office, and will involve tension and conflict in its execution. The latter point, that change is not a neutral, value-free process, comes across consistently as a distinctive feature of analyses which it is difficult, if not impossible, to disentangle from more 'managerial' explanations. Indeed, the word 'managerial' itself must imply power relationships, and therefore the possibility of conflict. Self is, perhaps, less overtly preoccupied with this aspect, and observes that 'administrative reorganisation is generally undertaken for a mixture of functional and managerial reasons'.[77] By this, he means that as the purpose of the administrative system is modified, the means to attaining it in terms of the disposition of powers and personnel may also have to undergo change. Alternatively, existing purpose may be inefficiently fulfilled, and require managerial changes. The latter are, in effect, subordinate to administrative function, being the means to declared ends. With respect to the

functions of the administrative apparatus, these will, according to Self, be subject to both political and technical influences - that is, debate on both ends and means - which may bring about a call for organisational change. He cautions, though, about expectations that such a change will easily be achieved:

> The organisational contours of the system are the result of constitutional and political factors which usually have deep historical roots, and major changes in the general structure of the system tend to be slow and difficult.[78]

Paulston makes similar points to Self's in identifying the ends and means components of change proposals. He quotes Crowfoot and Chesler on the necessity to be clear about the bases for these proposals if one wishes to identify the optimum way forward:

> All planned change efforts imply a commitment to a certain view of reality, and acceptance of certain modes of realising those ends. Those assumptions constitute the conscious or unconscious bases for selecting specific courses of action...[79]

The 'view of reality' mentioned here may be linked to the political input of Self's analysis, in the sense that 'reality' may refer to what is politically desirable, feasible and acceptable. In citing Seliger, too, he is making a similar point:

Seliger (1969) contends that all politicians decisions, including those concerned with educational reform, result from ends-means calculations in terms of both moral norms such as equity, justice, etc., and of technical norms such as efficiency, expediency and the like.[80]

Whilst arguing that 'moral' is too narrow an interpretation to put on the totality of political input, and 'equity' and 'justice' simplistic as descriptions of political aims, Seliger's point highlights again the importance of evaluating aims when discussing administrative change. This only begs the question of whose political aims we are talking about. If we define a political question as one concerned both with conflicting viewpoints and a desire on the part of participants to have their particular viewpoint prevail, we may be talking about input from outside the administrative structure, or conflict between members of the structure itself and those outsiders. In either case, we are concerned with the introduction of values to the process, conflicts between which must be resolved if the reform is to 'take' successfully. Paulston is explicit that 'major reforms are always a partisan, political process implying redistribution of power';[81] Salter and Tapper, equally, observe:

> In our model the change dynamic...assumes its educational forms through political negotiation. What educational authority the various parties exercise is thus dependent upon their ability to translate their political capital into effective political resources.[82]

On the subject of conflict, more needs to be said, and we will return to this shortly. Firstly, though, it will be worthwhile returning briefly to Self's point that reorganisation has both functional and managerial aspects to it, and considering what was happening in late nineteenth century educational reform. In functional terms, the main proposition was in changing the system to provide a more comprehensive educational structure at secondary level. There was a mixture of both client and policy aims involved - 'client' in the sense of reaching a larger number of eligible people with a more uniform provision; 'policy' in the sense of meeting the aims of a more efficient national education system, particularly with reference to competing systems in other countries. The managerial aims, on the other hand, were clear - to establish a co-ordinated system of secondary education under unified control, and to abolish the relative autonomy of the S.A.D. In identifying the components of the reform proposals in this way, it will be easier, later, to separate out the various elements of the political struggle which took place over the implementation of the proposals. In other words, discussion of the question of what the new structure was intended to achieve (the functional element) is usefully separated from the related question of how personnel

and powers were to be distributed so as to attain the new goals, and what modifications this implied to the pre-existing structure (the managerial element).[83]

Equilibrium and disequilibrium

It is not uncommon for writers to see the change process in public administration as a movement from equilibrium to disequilibrium, and back to equilibrium again. Musgrave[84] makes purely descriptive use of this insight, without linking it with any other theories of historical development, whilst Salter and Tapper[85] explicitly utilise the Marxist concepts of struggle, and a resolution of conflict of competing interests in a new synthesis. Both are dynamic theories which see change as the dominant feature, and stability as deviation from the norm, a temporary phenomenon which will be overtaken by pressure of ideas and events. A significant point here, of course, is that bureaucracies tend to structure themselves and arrange their activities to maintain their existences on a long-term basis, and the inevitable consequence of this will be a clash between the internal desire for stability and the external need for adaptability. It may be that such incompatibility will often dictate a more radical and drastic solution to administrative change than would be the case if government departments and agencies were less rigidly structured and more responsive to altered circumstances.

The equilibrium of Musgrave's analysis lies in his 'definition of the situation'. This refers to the 'forces at work in an institutional sphere and is derived from the value system of those who bring power to bear on the formulation of the definition'.[66] In other words, it may be said to represent the balance of opinion amongst those in a position to have such opinion felt, on the current formulation and direction of a particular policy question. This must include politicians of the governing and opposing parties, pressure groups and administrators. The concept must imply that such a balance, or 'truce situation', can exist, but this may be to ascribe too clear and definite a picture to the subject in hand. It would be my contention that a 'definition of the situation' in secondary education, if by this is meant some kind of balance or equilibrium amongst competing forces, did not exist until the period 1899/1902, when statutory imposition following prolonged debate brought some degree of clarity to the situation. Before this time, as Bryce indicated, separate development of different strands of advanced, school-based education could not be dignified with the term 'system', or unified under a common definition. Bryce bears unconscious witness to a lack of a 'definition of the situation', unless this can be given a minimalist connotation of acceptance of a *laissez-faire*, unstructured approach. Whilst expressing reservations about the use of the term 'definition of the situation', as defined by Musgrave, to describe the pre-1902 pattern, it may be applied more successfully to that obtaining post-1902, as indicated above. In Musgrave's terms, what provides the transition between the two is

the 'redefinition of the situation', the essential element in the change process.

According to Musgrave, the germs of the change are contained within the given 'definition' previously established. This is because:

> The norms and roles in the system will rarely be specified in exact detail and, therefore, a socially permitted range of indeterminacy will exist within which small differences are possible.[87]

He points out that 'minor changes that occur within the system can be absorbed within the range of indeterminacy allowed by the present definition',[88] but that cumulative change of this type, or evolution of the structure away from the original definition, can bring about the necessity for a more radical 'redefinition':[89]

> By the end of the century the educational system had evolved beyond the limits of the original definition. In addition, the different parts of the system (for example, the secondary and the technical sectors) were developing at very different rates...When the strains, either at the social-system level or at institutional level, become sufficiently intense...new or somewhat different beliefs are brought to bear on the situation and ultimately a redefinition of the situation is made. The important question is the determination of the 'threshold values beyond which equilibrium will break down'.[90]

He goes on to say that the result of this development will be governed by the relative strengths of interested parties, and that a new 'truce situation' will result.

It must be said that Musgrave's analysis concerns the whole range of the educational system from 1870, not simply that of secondary education. Given that no adequate 'definition' of secondary education, in his terms, existed before the reforms of 1902, it may be said that a very comprehensive 'range of indeterminacy' was the characteristic feature of this period. One might postulate that the tighter the 'definition' (given that the term connotes some stability of competing interests), the narrower the 'range of indeterminacy' is likely to be, and conversely that a looser 'definition' will allow scope for a much wider 'range'. The implication is that an initial lack of a 'definition' will necessarily lead to the taking of more far-reaching steps to establish one if the centrifugal forces unleashed by a wide 'range' take the situation beyond what, ultimately, proves to be unacceptable to those interests which have power to impose, or to influence, such a definition.

The statement of the new definition will be accompanied, according to Musgrave, by three developments designed to provide material and institutional backing to the reform: firstly, the pursuit of 'goal-attainment' through the appropriate allocation of resources; secondly, 'adaptation and integration' of institutions and workers to provide a co-ordination of effort;[3] thirdly, the essential

'pattern-maintenance' to induce conformity of personnel to the norms and values of the new system. It will be noted that each of these refers to the adoption of means, the ends which they serve being expressed, implicitly or explicitly, in the newly negotiated 'definition'.

Musgrave's assertion is that 'redefinition' is likely to differentiate the system, rather than resulting in rationalisation and simplification, notwithstanding the fact that some consensus has been achieved amongst interested parties on the path of reform. This increased complexity may lead to 'autonomous change' if it is catered for either by allowing a greater 'range of indeterminacy' which gives scope for reinterpretation, or even exploitation, of less clearly-defined norms, or by a tighter control of departmental personnel which may induce a 'greater chance of disagreement with the now explicit norms'. He considers the 'range of tolerance' under the 1902 Act to be wide, and subsequent developments to vindicate his hypothesis about 'autonomous change'. It is certainly the case that, over the last hundred years, the development of the educational system in England and Wales has been characterised by 'redefinitions' which have allowed considerable scope for divergent initiatives at the local level of provision. This has an institutional basis in successive governments' disinclination, following the late nineteenth century reforms, to give the central educational department full control of the system. In part, this was a reaction to what was seen by many as a stifling degree of self-imposition by the S.A.D., as the Report on the Bryce

hearings indicates. In the 1980s, an attempted radical 'redefinition' which moves the locus of initiative towards the centre, and which proposes a much narrower 'range', meets opposition from those groups long used to greater freedom of action. Although the aims associated with the redirection have been specified with some clarity, the history of educational change and the insights of organisational theory tell us that insufficient thought has been given to 'pattern-maintenance' as an essential accompaniment, quite apart from 'adaptation and integration' and an adequate resource allocation.

Musgrave's idea that educational change in this country is of a cyclical nature and evolutionary in character is echoed by the work of Salter and Tapper. Acknowledging Musgrave's assertion that it has had effects in two complementary areas, that of the structure of provision, and of the curriculum, broadly defined, they observe that:

> The dominant form of state sponsored change in Britain has been reformist; it has had a general impact upon the institutional character of education but a more restricted influence upon the experience of schooling.[92]

Beyond this, though, they are more explicitly conflict-theory oriented in their interpretation of the processes of educational change than Musgrave is, and are more inclined to specify the institutional components of struggle and stress the importance of

ideology as a potent and necessary weapon in the bid for supremacy in the reform struggle.

Central to their description is the idea that the process of educational change is political in character and focused on institutional conflict. The activities of the central organising bodies, the departments, are crucial to the outcome of the change proposals. They make the following point:

> ...tensions exist between economic base and superstructure and within the superstructure itself - that is, between the component institutions of the superstructure, of which the educational system is one...the tensions are created not simply as a result of passive structural impediments to the economic and social pressures, impediments which alone can distort and redirect that dynamic, but also as a result of counter-pressure which is essentially bureaucratic. It is out of the interaction of these pressures that the dynamic for change is born.[93]

By this they mean that social pressure for reform (reflecting, in Marxist terms, the reality of economic relationships within the state and the need for the education system to provide credentialling, a socialisation function, and so on), working through superstructure elements such as the party political system, pressure groups and public opinion, comes up against the

reactionary elements of bureaucratic resistance. These, according to Salter and Tapper, have two components:

> ...firstly, from the general need of modern society for rational modes of organising its increasingly complex system of social relationships and, secondly, from the specifically bureaucratic forms of state agencies, which have developed to the point where they are capable of generating and sustaining their own autonomous needs.[94]

The latter point has been dealt with extensively elsewhere, and needs no further elaboration here.[95] However, there is a further assertion that the bureaucratic elements are in a position to react to social pressures more quickly that other players in the drama, and may be able to capitalise on this to dominate the change process. So far as the reforms we are discussing are concerned, this is by no means certain. Although it is undoubtedly the case that the Education Department and the county councils benefitted at the expense of the S.A.D. and the school boards, the main impetus and initiative seems to have come from party input following a strong show of informed and popular opinion. The demise of the S.A.D., in particular, points to a relative failure of bureaucratic counter-pressure so far as this particular institution was concerned, and indicates a period in English educational history which was atypical in the comprehensiveness of its institutional change. Some reason for the inability of the S.A.D. to defend itself successfully may be found in the analysis of Salter and

Tapper on the role of ideology in the change process. It will be remembered that Bryce uncovered a clear ideological rejection of the S.A.D.'s educational objectives by a wide cross-section of individuals and groups, and an equally strong current of opinion favouring reform.[96] This had an overwhelming effect when translated into statutory form, overcoming S.A.D. objections, particularly as fragmentation of opinion amongst the central institutions towards the proposed changes left the S.A.D. isolated in its opposition. The crucial role of ideology in these developments can be seen by reference to the criteria laid down by Salter and Tapper for the introduction of successful educational change:

> The capacity of a group to initiate change is limited by the scope of its ideology...whether or not a potential educational change can be legitimised will depend on the availability and skills of intellectuals capable of building and maintaining a sound ideological position on behalf of an aspirant group...the role of ideology in educational change is complicated by the fact that it has to be functional both for the group sponsoring it...and for the broader social and economic pressures to which education is inevitably subject.[97]

Those supporting reform in the provision of secondary education held most of the ideological cards. They were vocal, influential and numerous. They proposed change which they felt was to their own benefit, and to the benefit of the nation and of the nation's

children. A reform momentum built up which was accepted and internalised by the party machine. The alternative, and discredited, ideology supportive of a narrower, more utilitarian secondary system, was unable to muster sufficient counter-vailing force. Henceforth, opposition to the now explicitly dominant ideology could only be made from within the parameters of the new system.

Although 1899 and 1902 mark the formal statement of change, it is by no means the case, as has been stressed, that change begins, or even ends, with such punctuating devices as statutes. In discussion of public policy, statutes are useful as organising tools and as expressions of government intent, but it cannot be assumed that the organisational change which follows them will fulfil that intent, assuming always that the intent is clear. Organisational structure may be changed, and with it the goals of a new system may be specified. But the stumbling-block to wholesale and unimpeded reform seems to be the inevitability of recreating a bureaucratic system as replacement for that which has been abolished. In fact, to speak of 'replacement' is, perhaps, to give the misleading impression that departments and other central bodies are dismembered, individual by individual, and that a completely fresh start can be made with personnel dedicated to new goals and methods and dismissive of previous relationships and practices. But this is not the case. For one thing, there is a distinctive way of doing things common to bureaucracies which will transcend changes in formal structure and function, and for another it is

more common for reorganisation to take place through the absorption and redeployment of fairly large groups of civil servants into new structures, where they may often, in fact, continue to fulfil the same, or similar functions as previously. This was the case with the Board of Education reforms, and it had important implications for the direction that the reforms actually took. The 1902 Act proposed further major modifications which lengthened the change process and may, through a sequence of 'continuous revolution', have had some role to play in breaking down the resistance of the ex-S.A.D. personnel. It is interesting to note that the main credit for imposing a distinctive stamp on the new system is usually given to Morant, who was himself within it. It is not idle fancy to propose that it takes a bureaucrat to make successful changes in the structure and goals of a bureaucratic organisation.

An observation may be used to conclude this discusssion of the change process. It summarises the difficulties politicians face in attempting to shift public policy:

> In a sense, 'people' do not resist change but, rather, patterns of interaction, relationships, bargains, negotiations, mutual adjustments and, above all, forms of solution or ways of handling problems resist change.[98]

The pattern of change is a multi-faceted phenomenon, dictated by the particular nature of the network of power relationships relevant to the matter in hand. The organisational components of

the change process are by no means the only relevant considerations, but they are quite central to an understanding of reform in public administration.

References

(1) The Internal Structure of Organisations

1. For example, see Self, Peter, *Administrative Theories and Politics*, GAU 1982, p. 20; Thomas, Rosamund, *The British Philosophy of Administration*, Longmans 1978, pp. 131-134.
2. Weber, Max, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organisations*, trans. Hendersons and Parsons, New York Press 1947.
3. see page 130.
4. Self, op.cit., p. 21.
5. Hall, P., Land, H., Parker, R., Webb, A., *Change, Choice and Conflict in Social Policy*, HEB 1978, p. 24.
6. ibid. In chapter 4 we see a classic example of this, as both the Education Department under Kekewich, and the S.A.D., under Abney, strive to gain their best advantage, organisationally, from the demands of the 1899 Board of Education Act.
7. Self, op.cit., p. 50.
8. Perrow, Charles, *Organisational Analysis - A Sociological View*, Tavistock 1974, p. 79, fig. 3.
9. Millett, John, *Organisation for the Public Service*, New York 1966.
10. Self, op.cit., p. 75.
11. Salter, Brian, and Tapper, Ted, *Education, Politics and the State*, Grant McIntyre 1981.
12. Perrow, op.cit., p. 50.
13. Salter and Tapper, op.cit., p. 7.

14. Weber, op.cit., quoted in Pugh, D.S., *Organisation Theory*, Penguin 1984, chapter 1.

15. Self, op.cit., p. 11.

16. Salter and Tapper, op.cit., pp. 57-58.

17. Thomas, op.cit., p. 24.

18. Salter and Tapper, op.cit., p. 221.

19. Quoted in Pugh, op.cit., p. 26.

20. Self, op.cit., p. 93.

21. Self, op.cit., p. 74.

22. see chapter 4, especially pp. 271-273. It becomes apparent that Sadler was not seen as 'one of us' by the civil servants, who could not fit him into a bureaucratic image of organisational behaviour.

23. Self, op.cit., p. 50.

24. Hall, R.H., *Organisations: Structure and Processes*, Prentice-Hall 1974, p. 206.

25. The question of lateral and vertical relationships between different parts of the new Board of Education, especially in relation to the provision of those types of education previously overseen by the Education Department and the S.A.D., much exercised planners, and in the end was determined as much by political manoeuvrings as by technical factors of educational administration.

26. Self, op.cit., p. 69.

27. Both the Education Department and the S.A.D. presented themselves with functional divisions in 1899, co-ordination being provided from the top. No specialised 'liaison' unit

existed to provide cross-Section integration. Compartmentalisation and inadequate communication were features criticised by an internal Education Department report. See chapter 4, reference 18, and pp. 236-7.

28. Warren, D.I., *Visibility and Conformity in Formal Organisations*, American Sociological Review, Vol. 33 Dec. 1968.

29. It is instructive to consider the degree to which the S.A.D. failed to fulfil either of these conditions.

(2) The functions and purposes of organisations (with particular reference to those in education)

30. It is a fact that the strength of this continuity may put the organisation into conflict with political realities which are more susceptible to change. The electoral system, for example, may provide a rapid and comprehensive modification in political input, while the bureaucracy is not open to such immediate influence. The two may get radically out of step.

31. Kekewich, G.W., *The Education Department and After*, Constable 1920.

32. Maclure, J. Stuart (ed.), *Educational Documents*, Methuen 1974, pp. 104-105.

33. Salter and Tapper, op.cit., p. 7

34. op.cit., p. 65

35. Paulston, R.G., *Conflicting Theories of Social and Educational Change*, University of Pittsburgh 1976, p. V.

36. Self, op.cit., p. 10.

37. It becomes apparent in the case of the educational reorganisation surrounding the setting-up of the Board of Education, that not only did the civil service play a major role in developing proposals for the reform, but that they were actively encouraged to do so by their political heads. whose grasp of the detail of reform, as opposed to the broad sweep of policy, was greatly lacking. See chapter 4.

38. *Report of the Machinery of Government Committee of the Ministry of Reconstruction (the Haldane Report)*, Cmd. 9230, H.M.S.O. 1918.

39. Gulick, L., and Urwick, L.F., *Papers on the Science of Administration*, New York 1937.

40. The strict functional division of both the Education Department and the S.A.D., and the disposition and ranking of personnel, lend weight to this assertion.

41. Perrow, op.cit., p. 69.

42. Self, op.cit., p. 66.

43. Pitt, D.C., and Smith, B.C., *Government Departments: an Organisational Perspective*, RKP 1981, p. 44.

44. Indeed, the primary purpose of Abney, appointed head of the S.A.D. in 1899, was to preserve as much of that body intact within the Board of Education as would be possible. His strategy, and successes, are detailed in the next chapter.

45. Perrow, op.cit., p. 136.

46. Self, op.cit., p. 92.

47. Self, op.cit., pp. 47-48.

48. Pitt and Smith, op.cit., p. 23.

49. Musgrave, P.W., *Sociology, History and Education*, Methuen 1970, pp. 18-19.

50. Pitt and Smith, op.cit., p. 24.

51. Self, op.cit., p. 4.

52. Perrow, op.cit., pp. 57-59.

53. Abney, appointed to oversee the demise of the S.A.D., was, by his indispensability, effectively guaranteed a prominent position under Kekewich in the Board of Education. Whilst wishing to preserve the essence of the S.A.D., co-optation to the Board of Education ensured that he had a vested interest in devising a system which would work without undue friction.

54. Perrow, op.cit., p. 97.

55. Self, op.cit., p. 87.

56. Self, op.cit., p. 103.

57. During the period 1899-1900 Devonshire, as Lord President, relied greatly on the bureaucracy to produce workable solutions to administrative problems of his own making concerning the future structure of the Board of Education.

58. Self, op.cit., p. 98.

59. see page 7.

(4) Politics and administration: the public sector organisation

60. Paulston, op.cit., p. V; Self, op.cit., p. 51; Salter and Tapper, op.cit., p. 5.

61. Self, op.cit., p. 3.

62. Self, op.cit., pp. 3-4.

63. Self, op.cit., pp. 90-91.

64. Abney's task during the reorganisation process was to preserve as far as possible the essential organisational centre of the S.A.D., the higher administrative apparatus, and in this he achieved a large measure of success.

65. Self, op.cit., p. 5.

66. Salter and Tapper, op.cit., p. 38.

67. Salter and Tapper, op.cit., p. 43.

68. This is apparent in Devonshire's handling of the reorganisation. See reference 57 above.

69. Salter and Tapper, op.cit., p. 39.

70. Self, op.cit., p. 5-6.

71. Self, op.cit., p. 6.

72. Self, op.cit., p. 7.

73. This is now being now resolved (1988), it seems likely, by a belated conversion to a more centrally defined curriculum. One must expect, of course, resistance to such proposals, as established patterns of influence and control are threatened.

74. References to First Division Association and Institute of Public Administration projected studies of political roles of civil servants - May 1985.

75. Thomas, op.cit.

76. *Haldane Report*, op.cit.

(5) Change and reorganisation

77. Self, op.cit., p. 82.

78. Self, op.cit., p. 80.

79. Paulston, op.cit., p. 3.

80. Paulston, op.cit., pp. 3-4.

81. Paulston, op.cit., Conclusion.

82. Salter and Tapper, op.cit., p. 83.

83. Chapter 4 deals primarily with these managerial aspects of reform.

84. Musgrave, op.cit.

85. Salter and Tapper, op.cit.

86. Musgrave, op.cit., p. 16.

87. Musgrave, op.cit., p. 17.

88. Musgrave, op.cit., p. 18.

89. Musgrave, op.cit., pp. 18-19.

90. Parsons, T., quoted in Musgrave, op.cit., p. 19.

91. The purpose of the Walpole Committee was precisely to formulate plans to achieve 'adaptation and integration'.

92. Salter and Tapper, op.cit., p. 19.

93. Salter and Tapper, op.cit., pp. 6-7.

94. Salter and Tapper, op.cit., p. 7.

95. see part (1) of this chapter.

96. see Chapter 2 on Ideology and the Bryce Report, p. 39.

97. Salter and Tapper, op.cit., pp. 66-67.

98. Perrow, op.cit., p. 173.

Chapter 4

Reorganisation proposals 1899-1902

The reorganisation of the central administration of education following the provisions and requirements of the Board of Education Act of 1899 and the anticipated requirements of the Education Bill introduced by the Duke of Devonshire to the House of Lords in June 1900.

The main official work on this subject was undertaken by the Walpole Committee on the Reorganisation of the Education Department and the S.A.D. This internal, civil service committee is of interest because it represents an organisational response to the problem of reorganisation - i.e. a departmental, bureaucratic reply to a set of requirements imposed from without which would modify those organisations participating in the exercise. It shows the working through of various interests and a conclusion which represents a new balance of organisational power. Of course, the recommendations could be modified in two main ways, both of which recognise the existence of competing sources of power. Firstly, the Committee's findings could be, and were, modified by the political masters, at least insofar as public pronouncements were concerned, but it must not be forgotten that any organisation under relatively autonomous day-to-day control has ways of interpreting externally imposed requirements to its advantage. Secondly, there is no guarantee that organisational response will be exactly as desired even when organisational leaders themselves draw up the

reorganisation proposals. In summary, there may be both external and internal reasons why the actual direction an organisation takes may diverge from that envisaged or intended.

The Walpole Committee'

Mention has been made of the Musgrave's 'redefinition of the situation'.[2] This process, it has been posited, was given impetus by the Bryce Report. In addition, it will be remembered, Musgrave asserted that the new definition must be accompanied by three developments designed to provide material and institutional backing to the reform - 'goal-attainment' (through appropriate resource allocation), institutional and personnel 'adaptation and integration' (to promote co-ordination of effort), and 'pattern-maintenance' (to promote conformity through resocialisation).

In anticipation of the passing of the Board of Education Bill, the Walpole Committee was set up in 1899 to make recommendations with respect to the three requirements just outlined- the first two, indeed, are directly implied by the terms of reference. What it did, and how the two principal protagonists in the drama fared (the Education Department and the S.A.D.), is the subject we turn to next.

Mention has been made of the methods by which politicians remit problems to the administrative system for solution.[3] It is apparent from the minutes of the Committee, and from the

correspondence on its deliberations, that this was certainly in mind when appointing the Committee to look into the question of the reorganisation of the central education service. The reorganisation had two distinct features to it:

a) following the Board of Education Act, the necessity to explore the question of the assimilation to the Education Department of the entire work of the S.A.D., and such educational work of the Charity Commission as would be deemed necessary;

b) within the context of the reforms outlined in a), the need to determine the relative organisational emphases in the new Board of Education to be accorded to non-elementary education - i.e. to literary/classical, to modern/scientific, and to technological, all of which had conventional or adopted claims to the title, or share in the title of, 'secondary education'. The existence and work of the proposed Elementary Branch (formerly the Education Department itself), remained relatively uncontroversial.

<u>The assimilation of the S.A.D. and the Charity Commission</u>

One of the prime features of the reorganisation proposals of the late 1890s was the movement against the influence of the S.A.D. in post-elementary education. The Board of Education Bill of 1899 was to give statutory sanction to the S.A.D.'s loss of independent activity as an organisation in its own right. Against the S.A.D.'s

continued existence there was lined up a formidable array of organisational power:

1) Parliament, in the process of giving legal authority for change;
2) The Education Department, which stood to gain greatly from merger, in that all secondary education questions covered by the Bill would now come under the direct control of Kekewich, erstwhile head of the Education Department, as would the officials administering them;
3) Organisations outside the central government sphere, such as the Headmasters' Conference. The latter exercised an influence at the centre disproportionate to its size. It was well organised and in close contact with the Secretary of the Education Department, Kekewich.

However, the formal announcement of desirable change does not imply that change will indeed proceed as desired. Although the existence and name of the S.A.D. might disappear, there were certain factors which allowed it to determine, to some extent, the pattern of its own assimilation:

1) The lack of clear lead from the centre (i.e. from the politicians) as to the form of the reorganisation. The Bill was introduced on March 14th 1899 and received the Royal Assent on the following August 9th, but no plans existed at the outset for absorbing the S.A.D. Indeed,

the Walpole Committee was not appointed until July 4th 1899, and its Second Report, which dealt with the two bodies, was not issued until January 20th 1900 (indeed, the Fourth Report, dealing with the Board of Agriculture's educational functions and the relevance of these to the Act's integrative proposals, was not submitted by Walpole to Devonshire until March 31st 1900, the day before the Act was to become operational). This state of affairs meant that the actual (rather than outline) reform proposals became a matter of internal negotiation rather than external imposition, a situation in which the S.A.D., although disadvantaged, did not have its room for manoeuvre as tightly circumscribed as it would have had had detailed public pronouncement of change plans been published in advance;

2) Captain Abney of the S.A.D. was a member of the Walpole Committee. Although his influence was eclipsed by that of Kekewich and Tucker of the Education Department (an arrangement reinforcing the relative statuses of the two bodies) he had official standing and a forum in which to ensure that the interests of the S.A.D. were best represented. By acquiescing in certain matters of lesser import, such as the reorganisation of sections within the S.A.D. clerical structure, and changes in the number and functions of officials, he was able to stand firm and make his opinions felt on matters more relevant to the S.A.D.'s

interests. Specifically, he reserved his energies for matters connected with the administrative sections of the S.A.D. and the future relationship of science and art to the rest of the Education Department's responsibilities. This concern took two forms - vertically, with respect to the chain of command which would now lie above the administration of science and art, and laterally with respect to those areas of educational administration to be put in parity of status with these subjects, or in inferior or superior positions. By becoming a member of the Committee, by being able to choose the ground over which he was willing to fight, and by having the good fortune to possess a personal and official acceptability which would place him in a position of significant authority in the new structure, he was able to exercise a degree of damage limitation which would otherwise not have been possible;

3) Any organisation, retaining largely intact most of its members, who continue to undertake similar tasks as previously will, even if absorbed into a body larger than itself with official power of command over it, continue to exhibit a peculiar identity, method of operation and corporate spirit which may hinder integrative efforts, or even provide disintegrative tendencies, long after amalgamation has apparently been successfully achieved. If not brought into line by a strong centralising

tendency, the whole new organisation may in reality operate as a grouping of semi-autonomous bodies. The implications for policy are the same as that for the organisation. Policy may be disconnected and inconsistent, and its application an administrative mess.

Neither the 1899 Act, nor that of 1902, provided more than an administrative framework for change. The actual path of change, as is so often the case with public policy, depended on organisational response to political initiatives, and organisational initiatives fashioning political responses.

The actual reorganisation of the education service owed, in the final analysis, as much to factors external to the deliberations of the Walpole Committee as to the Committee's recommendations, which were to some extent overtaken by events. Nevertheless, the four Reports of the Committee represent the only formally commissioned works on the reformation of the Education Department and the only formal statements of organisational response to change.

Of immediate interest is the marked discrepancy in the treatment of the Education Department and the S.A.D. by the Committee. Although the initial terms of reference of the Committee couch the reorganisation in neutral terms (they were enlarged in November 1899 to take account of the Board of Education Act's proposals for secondary education, and the undertaking by the government to establish a third branch of the Education Office to deal with

this), the primary task which exercised the Committee was that of dismembering the S.A.D. and integrating the reconstituted parts into the Education Department. In this, Abney could not but agree. A minute from Devonshire of 29th June 1899 established Kekewich as head of both the Education Department and the S.A.D., and put Abney under him as head of science and art work. Measures to put this minute into effect formed part of the Committee's brief. The formal, official nature of the minute left no doubt as to Abney's relationship to Kekewich, but the terms of reference -

> To consider and report what changes in staff and organisation of the Education Department and the S.A.D. are necessary in order to carry into effect the Lord President's Minute of 29 June 1899 and to bring these Departments into closer relation with each other -[4]

left some room for manoeuvre for Abney within the accepted context of the enquiry that the S.A.D. and its officials would be in a position of subordination to the Education Department and its Secretary. The origins of the Walpole Committee were unexceptional, giving no indication either of the urgency of the matter or of the significance of involving the bureaucracy in its own reorganisation:

The most urgent and at the same time the easiest problem is the amalgamation of the D.S.A. with the Education Department at Whitehall. For the purpose appoint a small departmental committee...to sketch out a plan for distribution of staff and work...[5]

Kekewich himself wrote to Devonshire on June 8th 1899:

> I have conferred with Captain Abney, and neither he nor I think that any difficulty or friction is likely to arise from the amalgamation of the Departments, provided that it is carried out on the lines of which you have already communicated your approval.[6]

With respect to the organisation of the higher administrative staff and the clerical staff of the S.A.D., the reform proposals contained in the Second Report[7] are in all essential respects identical to those put forward to the Committee by Abney in Memoranda of July and November 1899.[8] So far as the higher administration is concerned, the actual and recommended distribution of posts was as follows:

Table 1: S.A.D. - Higher Administrative Staff

Existing 1899	Proposed by Abney in July 1899 and adopted as recommendations by the Walpole Committee in January 1900
1 Secretary	1 Principal Assistant Secretary
1 Assistant Secretary	2 Asst. Secretaries
1 Chief Clerk	3 Senior Examiners
1 Director for Science	3 Junior Examiners
1 Assistant Director for Science	
1 Director for Art	
1 Assistant Director for Art	
2 Official Examiners	
3 Assistant Examiners	

There appears to be a distinct diminution in the higher structure of the S.A.D., but the changes are more illusory than real. Abney had to concede the loss of the independent Secretaryship, and was willing to accept that the lower clerical staff should be reorganised to minimise routine distinctions between science and art, as will be seen, but he was able to keep the essential administrative work largely intact under his direct supervision. Although the posts of Directors and Assistant Directors for Science and for Art were to be abolished, the two new Assistant Secretaries under Abney were to take responsibility for these areas, and move with the Examiners to Whitehall at a later date.

With regard to the clerical staff, it is most revealing to look at the pattern of sectional organisation and the proposals made for reforming it. Abney, in his Memo of July 1899, had recommended rationalisation:

> It is clear...that considerable economy can be effected by amalgamating - as far as circumstances permit - the numerous separate sections which at present exist.[9]

With some revision of a technical nature, his proposals were accepted and written into the Report. It will be seen later that this was in complete contrast to the Committee's approach to similar questions in the Education Department. The existing and the proposed structures of the clerical sections of the S.A.D. were as follows:

Table 2: S.A.D. - Clerical Sections

Existing	Walpole Committee's proposals based on Abney's Memoranda of November 1899.
1. Secretarial 2. Registry 3. Postal 4. Typewriting 5. General Stores 6. Accounts 7. Committee 8. Science Claims 9. Science Correspondence 10. Science Results 11. Schools of Science 12. Technical Instruction 13. Art	1. Routine Division: all clerical work pertaining to science and art - i.e. the formation and continuance of Science and Art schools and classes. their exams., the tabulation and announcement of results; examination of claims, etc. 2. Second Division: Registry and Copying (including Staff Records), Accounts and Stores

One of the Senior Examiners proposed for the administrative structure was to have immediate supervision of the Second Division, and be responsible also for the 'general supervision and organisation of the Clerical and Subordinate Staff of the Department, and for all matters of discipline...under the orders of the principal assistant secretary'.[10]

In summary, what we have here is evidence of a skilful and successful rearguard action on behalf of a threatened organisation. Abney conceded on points which were either imposed from without, or which could be made without destroying the essential unity of the department. He recognised the basic organisational truth that formal structural change may not be sufficient to destroy the unity of an institution if it fails to make a significant impact on those parts of the institution which can maintain a continuity of purpose. In the case of a government department, this is represented by the higher administration, and it was this that Abney defended with success. However, larger external issues loomed which threw these plans into disarray and forced Abney into a second round of defensive manoeuvring.[11] This was the addition to the Committee's brief made in November 1899, to the effect that it should have 'regard, in their recommendations, to the provisions of the Board of Education Act relating to Secondary Schools and the undertaking of the Government to establish a third branch of the Education Office to deal therewith'.[12] This was to upset the balance, in that it brought into play arguments and forces, many from outside the education service and therefore less controllable,

on the question of the organisational structure necessary for the supervision of the various forms of post-elementary provision. More will later be said on this topic,[3] but firstly it is instructive to return to the original brief and compare the Education Department's response to the call for reform to that which was elicited from the Science and Art Department.

Of the fifty Sections of the Second Report, exactly half are devoted to discussion of the reorganisation of the S.A.D. within an expanded Education Department. Of the then current Education Department with, it must be said, equally pressing problems of administrative efficiency, only eight Sections make explicit mention, and these deal almost exclusively with matters of peripheral importance, such as salaries. On the fundamental question of the reform of the clerical sections, the issue is fudged - indeed, the statements made in the Report contain self-contradictory elements and represent a deliberate attempt to gloss over a need for reform acknowledged both by the the Department itself in internal investigations and by the Walpole Committee in its deliberations.

Discussion of the Education Department is reached in Section 42, with the statement:

> ...we would commence by saying that we have not found it necessary to propose many changes in the constitution of the (Education Department), as we are of opinion that the existing organisation is based on right principles.'[14]

The opinion recorded here is explicitly contradicted by portions of Section 47, which states, with reference to the clerical sections:

> The sections differ greatly in respect of the number of staff, and, to some extent, in the quality of the work, and the division of duties between them does not appear to be altogether satisfactory. If the department could be organised *de novo* the number of the sections could no doubt be reduced, and the duties rearranged.'[15]

This ambivalence of approach, as compared with the directness with which the S.A.D. had been treated, stems directly from the fact that the Walpole Committee had been appraised of the organisational shortcomings of the Education Department, but had been persuaded by Kekewich to play them down. Bureaucratic honesty required them to make recommendations for reform - bureaucratic solidarity led them to support Kekewich in his desire for a 'softly, softly' approach to change from within the department, whereas the firm, comprehensive and public recommendations made on the S.A.D. were designed to seek external authority for the Education Department to absorb it. The dominant organisation was clearly trying to resist a reorganisation from without for itself whilst using external

forces to sanction reform of the S.A.D. to the Education Department's advantage.

The Committee had at least two Education Department reports as evidence when considering its recommendations. The first, 'upon the existing accommodation and the probable requirements of the department in new buildings',[16] was made in 1896. It commented that:

> ...the main and pervading defect of the present chance-medley of the buildings (*they were on five different sites*) is that they defy due organisation of the work. The large volume of public business cannot be properly arranged, supervised or directed, because it cannot be put into due correlation. Sections which have immediately to deal with one another cannot be put into proximity.

This analysis is used in the second Walpole Report to justify a moratorium on administrative reorganisation within the Education Department:

> ...at the present time it is not possible for us to recommend an immediate reorganisations of the sections owing to the practical difficulty arising from the distribution of the staff in several widely separated buildings.[17]

This is all very well so far as it goes. What the Report suppresses are the findings and recommendations of another departmental committee, which were published in July 1899, one week after the first meeting of the Walpole Committee.[18] Far from providing a justification for the *status quo*, the departmental committee report highlights the faults and inadequacies of the clerical organisation of the Education Department. The main thrust of its criticism concerns the lack of uniformity in size and importance of the eighteen clerical sections, and the apparent arbitrariness and illogicality of the distribution of functions therein. It stresses the importance of personalities in creating and perpetuating such a system:

> In other Sections, as that for Inspectors' Diaries and Endowed Schools, the work is most heterogeneous, a bundle of incongruous functions, held together only by the person of the Head of the Section.[19]

In identifying the causes of the problem, they make comment on organisational response to change - in this case, an *ad hoc* incrementalism with respect to the adoption of new functions, and a certain ossification and distortion as the emphasis of the Department's work changed whilst personnel resisted the necessary redeployments and reallocations of duties:

> ...first, the rapid growth of the Department, an involuntary expansion too rapid and continuous to admit of adequate adjustments of organisation...Each Act has added a considerable group to the staff. Such groups required from the first separate and responsible Heads; but their early importance may either have diminished or increased with time; and hence disparate Sections.[20]

The second reason they identify is that found in the previous report of 1896, and which Walpole used to justify its recommendation that no immediate clerical reorganisation of the Education Department take place - that of the accommodation problem.

In summary, we note the fact that both the 1896 and 1899 Departmental Committee Reports had commented on the poor provision of accommodation for the Education Department and the inhibiting effect this had on administrative efficiency. The Walpole Committee cited this fact in making its recommendations that no radical reorganisation of the clerical sections of the Education Department was presently possible, precisely because new accommodation was not yet available. Walpole chose to ignore, in its public recommendations, the 1899 Committee's proposals for a radical reshaping of the Education Department, which involved a rationalisation of the eighteen Sections into eight Divisions, in order that 'both efficiency and economy of labour would be promoted...' It ignored it firstly, for the reason already cited,

that the Education Department preferred to keep internal reorganisation under internal control ('that might be left for the Department to settle with the Treasury') and did not wish to be pinned down by public recommendations which might receive official approval and thus remove the initiative from it and, secondly, because Kekewich did not wish to tackle the entrenched positions which the 1899 Report had identified. He recognised, in other words, a potential or actual resistance to reform in his own department, and took the way out which offered least immediate problems. Evidence for this is contained in the transcript of Minutes of the Walpole Committee's meetings of December 13th 1899. The principle adopted follows from an observation made by Kekewich, in which he referred to the question of reorganisation of the Education Department. The Minutes record:

> He thought there were two opportunities presented to the Committee, 1) either to touch it with a light hand or 2) to go into it and face the difficulties. But he was sure that if the ideal system were met with, it would be smashed by the new Office. He would suggest touching it with a light hand.[21]

And this was what was done, as we have seen. It seems strange, though, that Kekewich should have been concerned that a reformed system in the Education Department might be rendered unworkable by the requirements of the new amalgamated Education Department, since the latter was precisely what the Committee was meant to be making recommendations about. It is strange also that the reasons put

forward by Kekewich for not tackling the Education Department (apart from the accommodation problem) did not inhibit him or the Committee from recommending wholesale reorganisation of the S.A.D. What he had said was that:

> The Education Department was conscious that there were too many Sections and that they should be amalgamated. They were, however, hampered by vested interests. It was intended to combine Sections as vacancies occurred...all these changes might be left for the Education Department to carry out with the Treasury.[22]

The Committee apparently recognised the existence of the eighteen Sections of the Education Department, but would not approve a rationalisation into eight Divisions, but did not demur in a proposal to reorganise the thirteen Sections of the S.A.D. into two large Divisions. on the basis that:

> ...this arrangement (*of the S.A.D.*) appears to us to be faulty in more than one respect. There are too many and in some cases too small sections, and the classification involves in some branches that distinction between the Science and the Arts sides, the continuation of which we have already deprecated in an earlier paragraph of this report.[23]

Some inconsistency might be observed here. In both the Education Department and in the S.A.D., the Committee recognised

fundamentally similar inadequacies in the clerical organisations. With respect to the former, it made no public recommendations for reform, but produced statements which, in their self-contradiction, indicated the discrepancy between its knowledge of the necessity for reform and its estimation of the advantages to be gained, or conflicts avoided, by not pressing that knowledge into firm proposals. With respect to the latter, it had been established by statutory and other official devices that subordination and integration were required, and the Committee was happy to pursue this line to its conclusion, notwithstanding the vested interests which had, in the case of the Education Department, discouraged them from adopting a similar line. Both Departments had inadequate clerical organisations, vested interests (greater, possibly, in the case of the S.A.D. because of the split between Arts and Sciences) to overcome, and accommodation problems. Selective emphasis, or lack of emphasis, with respect to these three conditions, allowed the Committee to make different recommendations, as the following diagram shows:

Table 3: A comparison of the Walpole Committee's responses to the need for reorganisation of the clerical sections of the Education Department and of the Science and Art Department.

	Inadequacy of Clerical Organisation	Existence of Vested Interests	Accommodation Problems
Education Department	Played Down	Emphasised	Emphasised
S.& A. Department	Emphasised	Played Down	Played Down

Both Departments could be shown to be afflicted by inadequate clerical organisations, by the existence of vested interests, and by accommodation problems. In the case of the Education Department, the Committee played down the first factor and emphasised the other two, thereby making a case for *not* proposing any changes. On the other hand, in the S.A.D., which it wished to see reorganised, it emphasised the first factor and played down the other two. Selective use of evidence was made in this way to avoid public recommendations on the reorganisation of the Education Department, which would tie that Department down, but to seek such public approval for change in the S.A.D. Here we see a dominant organisation deliberately seeking public approval for action against another organisation, whilst distancing itself from such threatening influences. The importance of this is that public policy-making is exercised through, and frequently by, departments, and so the behaviour of such departments *vis-à-vis* other departments and agencies whose functions are complementary to, or in competition with, theirs, may have profound implications for the future direction of national policy.

Whilst the treatment of the S.A.D. was clearly designed to subordinate the entire work of that department to the designs of Kekewich, as head of the soon-to-be-created Board of Education, we find a less clearly-defined pattern with respect to the educational functions of the Charity Commission (and, less importantly, those of the Board of Agriculture). This discrepancy of treatment followed directly from the differences in the relative

organisational responsibilities of the three bodies. Both the terms of reference of the Walpole Committee, and the relevant clause of the Board of Education Act, which stipulated that 'The Board of Education shall take the place of the Education Department (including the Department of Science and Art)',[24] allowed no discretion with respect to the S.A.D., or any of its functions, remaining outside the new body. This was not the case with the Charity Commission, which was only peripherally an educational body, its responsibilities extending to the making of schemes for endowed schools, and not at all to decisions about curriculum, teacher appointments, and so forth. The question therefore had to arise as to which Charity Commission functions were to be transferred to the Board of Education. The Act was no help, stating:

> It shall be lawful for Her Majesty in Council, from time to time, by Order, to transfer to, or make exercisable by, the Board of Education any of the powers of the Charity Commissioners or of the Board of Agriculture in matters appearing to Her Majesty to relate to education...[25]

The Third Report of the Walpole Committee expresses the difficulties they faced in making decisions about the Charity Commission,[26] and their meetings chart their confusion as to which course to take in their recommendations. The essential differences in the treatment of the S.A.D. and the Charity Commission can be understood with reference to the following table:

Table 4: Comparison of the relative functional positions of the S.A.D. and the Charity Commission at the time of the Walpole Committee deliberations.

Science and Art Department	Charity Commission
1) Public pronouncements specified or implied its total assimilation to the new organisation.	1) Public pronouncements did not bring its continued existence into question.
2) Its functions were totally assimilable to the new organisation.	2) Its functions were only partly assimilable to the new organisation. Its major functions were unrelated to those of the new organisation.
3) Expertise in transferred functions was readily available in the new organ-isation.	3) Expertise to manage transferred functions was not available in the new organisation.
4) Functions to be transferred were readily identifiable.	4) Functions to be transferred were not readily identifiable.
5) Dominant ideology supported loss of independent existence and functions.	5) Strong ideological motives for transfer of educational functions were not expressed.

The set of factors relevant to the Charity Commission's situation made for an untidy solution to rationalisation plans. This problem might have been overcome if a clearer lead had been given by Devonshire as to the government's requirements, but since this was not forthcoming, the Charity Commission was able successfully to defend its expertise in the area of educational endowments and resist what were, admittedly, half-hearted attempts to find a solution which would enable an immediate transfer of functions to the Board of Education. A very similar situation existed with the educational powers of the Board of Agriculture. The target of the Committee, and of the Board of Education Act, had been, first and last, the demise of an independent S.A.D.

Analysis of the Committee's work on the functions of the Charity Commission shows clearly how difficult it found it to tie up that body tidily in its reorganisation proposals. The origins of the problem go back to early 1898, when draft proposals were being framed for the Board of Education Bill. Devonshire presented to Cabinet the draft Bill itself and the specific Order in Council which might be employed to make the transfer of Charity Commission powers to the Board. In a Cabinet paper he introduced both, stating:

...this Bill has two objects:-

1. The amalgamation of the Science and Art Department with the Education Department, under one permanent head.

2. The transfer to the Board of Education of *some of the powers now exercised by the Charity Commissioners in regard to education*, and the exercise by the latter of *such powers as they retain*, in co-operation with, or as agents of, the Board of Education.[27] (my italics)

Once again, the clarity of purpose with respect to the assimilation of the S.A.D. may be seen, but the vagueness of the policy proposals for the Charity Commission was not to be resolved satisfactorily. The vagueness on *functional* change was to lead inevitably to vagueness on *institutional* change. Despite what has just been said, the draft Order in Council relating to Charity Commission educational powers was fairly detailed and explicit, but this early attempt to specify functional reorganisation was not to be sustained. The first draft of the Bill had stated, *inter alia*:

(2) The Charity Commissioners shall, in matters relating to the administration of any trust for the purposes of education, act under the directions of the Secretary for Education.

(3) It shall be lawful for Her Majesty in Council, by order, to transfer to the Secretary for Education all or any of the powers and duties of the Charity Commissioners...which appear to her Majesty in Council to affect education...[28]

This has a directness about it with respect to the desired seat of power in educational trust work, but the Bill as introduced to the House of Lords on August 1st 1898 showed a marked rethinking.[29] Out went the notion that the Charity Commission would 'act under the directions of the Secretary for Education', and a more elaborate scheme of Charity Commission reserved powers, and shared powers, was proposed. It was unsatisfactory in its ambiguities. The Victoria University, which held a Conference on Secondary Education on late December 1898, passed a resolution which stated:

> That the relations of the proposed Board of Education to the Charity Commissioners should be more clearly defined in the Bill so as to avoid dual control.[30]

Devonshire passed a copy to Kekewich for his comments, the latter replying tersely that:

> The less taken from the Charity Commission at present the better.[31]

The Bill, and the subsequent Act, adopted a vague formula, dropping specific reference to division of powers (except that referring to the discretion of the Commission to decide what was 'educational' in its trust work) and introducing the catch-all generalisation about 'matters appearing to... relate to education' referred to above.[32]

The pattern of thought on the question of Charity Commission powers had proceeded, therefore, as follows:

1) The initial draft of the Bill, and relevant Order in Council, had been clear in their intention to subordinate the Commission to the Board on educational questions.

2) The Bill as introduced to Parliament gave a great deal more discretion to the Commission than the first draft had. In particular, it gave the Commission sole right to put a construction on a scheme or document.

3) In the Statute, the right conferred to the Commission in the Bill to determine the meaning of a scheme or document was made more specific, in that it was given the sole right to determine whether a question was *educational* or not. The Commission's proposed subordinate role of the first draft was transformed to one of continuing independence and discretion by the Statute, at least for the foreseeable future.

An interesting point is that the Walpole Committee, which had been charged, indirectly, with considering the transfer of powers from the Charity Commission to the Board of Education, did not pursue the matter with great vigour. Kekewich, as we saw above,[33] did not wish to support clear and irrevocable schemes for the immediate transfer of functions. With this in mind, it must be said that his thoughts on the matter in the Committee, exactly one year later, to some extent represent the playing-out of a role, as he had clearly been closely in touch with Devonshire's thoughts on the question

for some time, and had no need to go along with the Committee's painful search for enlightenment as to what the Duke intended them to do in this matter of Commission powers.

In the Committee's meeting of November 24th 1899, Stephen Spring Rice, Treasury representative, asked Kekewich whether the government would convey to it which powers of the Commission were to be transferred to the Board of Education. Kekewich replied that 'that matter was one which the government might consider the Committee should determine'.[34] This would be consistent with the government's failure to produce a firm set of proposals on this question, as has been shown. Spring Rice appeared unsatisfied with Kekewich's reply however, and on December 1st asked the latter to put the same question to Devonshire. Kekewich complied by sending a Memo to Devonshire, and was able, unsuprisingly, to convey to the Committee on December 13th the same reply that he had given Spring Rice on the earlier occasion.

On December 22nd, Fearon, Committee member and Secretary to the Charity Commission, produced a Memo on the transfer of Commission powers. During January 1900, he began to build up a list of objections to the immediate transfer of large functions to the Board, and other members, Spring Rice and Kekewich among them, obliged him by posing further arguments against a wholesale and precipitate redistribution. In the third week of January a Memo was despatched to Devonshire setting out the Committee's conclusions on the transfer, and by mid-February Walpole was able

to announce that the Duke had expressed his general approval of their thoughts on this matter.

The formal statement of the Committee's position is found in the Third Report, released on March 14th 1900. They recommended that certain enumerated powers could be transferred immediately or in the near future, but concluded, with masterly understatement:

> ...there remain the following powers which it may perhaps be considered expedient to transfer from the Charity Commissioners to the Board of Education at some more distant date, but which we do not propose to discuss particularly in this report, because we think that it would not be desirable that they should be transferred in the near future.
>
> *They are the powers exercised by the Charity Commissioners under the provision of the Charitable Trusts Acts and Endowed Schools Acts for the regulation, administration and control of Educational Endowments in England and Wales generally...so far as these powers appear to Her Majesty to relate to education.*[35]
>
> (my italics)

One might be forgiven for asking whether the Committee was advocating the transfer of significant powers at all, and the answer was that, in general, they were not.

So far as Board of Agriculture functions were concerned, a similar pattern unfolded. The Board representative convinced the Committee, without difficulty, that the work was of too technical a nature for the Board of Education to carry. He went so far as to say that the Board would oppose any loss of functions unless the Board of Education were to equip itself properly for the job. The Committee took the line of least resistance, the Minutes recording:

> The Committee arrived at the conclusion that it is desirable *in certain circumstances* to transfer the work and powers; and *in the essence of things*, it will have to be made provision for *very soon*.
>
> They were agreed that the work should be transferred, but the *precise date they could not say; when the work develops* then it should be done.[36]
>
> (my italics)

In conclusion, the Charity Commission and the Board of Agriculture suffered a different fate at the hands of the Committee than did the S.A.D. This was not a chance occurrence. It followed fundamentally from the application and interplay of various factors in the several organisations concerned:

1) Ideological opposition to the activities of the S.A.D. had been clearly, widely and forcefully expressed in informed opinion, had been internalised by the governing Conservative

Party, and found expression in internal reform propositions and in public legislative proposals.

2) Accompanying the proposals to reform the system was a positive attempt to replace it with a structure which would receive widespread support. The reform movement thus had a double strength - support for plans to dismantle and assimilate the S.A.D., and support for the rationalised structure which was to take its place. The government thus had only to ride this wave of popular sentiment to a successful conclusion, and the fact that it made only slow and halting progress towards this end after Bryce reported in 1895 is testimony to the inefficiency of the political process in this instance.

3) The Charity Commission was the guardian of the 'secondary' school (about 600 at this time were under Schemes made under the Endowed Schools Acts[37]), the relative demise of which in terms both of numbers and curricular influence had done so much to fuel the fires of disquiet, as Bryce testifies. But the Commission could not be assimilated to the Education Department as could the S.A.D. Its area of competence was not that of the Education Department. But this did not matter. Kekewich was quite untroubled by the Walpole Committee's inability to suggest a formula to incorporate the Commission's educational functions at an early date into the functions of the Board of Education. He was quite happy to accept Fearon's insistence that expertise was lacking in the education

departments, and that rapid transfer would be a mistake. He accepted it because the Commission did not pose a threat. It did not interfere in curricular matters. It would do nothing radical or unacceptable while the more pressing problem of the S.A.D. was dealt with. A holding operation was quite sufficient, and this is what was proposed.

4) Whilst the secondary schools, locked in to the endowment system, were central to the enquiry, the same could not be said of the institutions supported by the Board of Agriculture in education. But this provided every reason why it should be treated in a similar fashion to the Charity Commission.

T H Elliott, Secretary to the Board of Agriculture, was appointed to the Walpole Committee at the end of February 1900.[38] In fact, agricultural education was considered of such peripheral importance that Elliott was treated more as a witness than as a Committee member, did not attend all meetings, and failed to sign the Fourth Report, which dealt with agricultural questions. He indicated that the Board would not acquiesce in the transfer of its educational functions until the Lord President sanctioned the creation of a technical branch in the Board of Education which might have sufficient expertise to carry them out. The Committee accepted these strictures, dealing with them by transferring the whole question of assimilation to some future, unspecified date. The draft Fourth Report was considered formally only once, at the last meeting of the Committee on March 16th 1900,

when it was passed for signature. The entire question of agricultural education was passed through with great, one might say indecent, haste.

The differential treatments of the organisations considered by the Walpole Committee may be summarised thus:

The Education Department: This was to be the core body of the new Board of Education, headed by Kekewich, who was the dominant figure on the Walpole Committee. The Department, although, on its own admissions, badly in need of internal reorganisation, was treated lightly in the public pronouncements of the Committee. Kekewich intended that internal reforms should be under his control, in consultation with the Treasury, and should not be subject to the pressures which would be generated from without if the Committee were to 'go public' on its deficiencies. This episode provides an example of an organisation taking care to protect itself, in a potentially damaging situation, from possibly hostile environmental forces.[39]

The S.A.D.: Whilst wishing to insulate the Education Department from external influences, the opposite was actively sought by the Committee for the S.A.D. Its deficiencies (not dissimilar to those of the Education Department, as has been shown) were fully exposed, and public sanction was sought for the actions which would, once and for all, end its independent existence. This was not difficult, since the sentiment was anyway in accordance with

majority informed opinion.[40] Kekewich was prepared to allow Abney some latitude in making proposals for the pattern of assimilation, because they could be contained within the former's established future control over both the S.A.D. and over Abney himself.

The Charity Commission and the Board of Agriculture

It will be remembered that the original terms of reference of the Committee of July 4th 1899 had not made any mention of either of these two organisations. At the first meeting of the Committee on July 19th, Fearon of the Charity Commission was not present - indeed, he was not appointed until early November, when Devonshire enlarged the terms of reference. It required a further Minute from the Duke, on February 28th 1900, to engage the Committee in a discussion of agricultural education and to add Elliott to its number.

From the outset, there was apparent confusion in the Committee as to what exactly Devonshire wanted from them with respect to Charity Commission powers relating to education. The person least knowledgeable in this respect appeared to be the Chairman, Walpole, and the best informed, Kekewich. On November 24th, Spring Rice, as indicated earlier,[41] asked Kekewich to indicate which Charity Commission powers were to be transferred to the Board of Education. Kekewich had replied to the effect that 'that matter was one which the Government might consider the Committee should determine'. Spring Rice persisted, asking Kekewich on December 1st to ask the

Lord President for some indication of the powers to be transferred from the Charity Commission. Walpole, who appears not have been involved in this matter, gave his opinion that the transfer was not a question for discussion. He was wrong, and was obliged to inform the Committee on December 13th that Kekewich had received an answer from Devonshire to the effect that the latter wished the Committee to deliberate and to provide answers to these questions. Devonshire had given an undertaking, during the Parliamentary passage of the Board of Education Bill, that a branch of the Board would be established to deal with secondary education. It is apparent that he had given no detailed consideration to the question of how this would be achieved, and the Committee received the unenviable task of making recommendations whilst receiving no guidance on the matter. The Board of Education Act itself made no specific mention of *which* Charity Commission powers might be transferred, or *when*. It is not surprising that the Third Report of the Committee glossed over the question entirely, making valiant but empty attempts to provide an answer. The main thrust of the Report is contained in the following extracts:

> In commencing our enquiry we at once found ourselves confronted with considerable difficulty...until it is decided when, and to what extent, the powers of the Charity Commissioners, or of the Board of Agriculture, relating to Education, shall be transferred to, or made exercisable by, the Board of Education, and until it has been ascertained how many schools avail themselves of the option of being

inspected, it is impossible to lay down with any approach to accuracy the staff which will be necessary to cope with the work which will in consequence be entrusted to the Board of Education.[42]

Devonshire had made a *political* commitment which had not been thought through, and which had immense *administrative* implications. He remitted the problem to a bureaucratic organisation for solution, but for various reasons that problem was not immediately soluble:

a) It was a technically difficult exercise both to determine which powers of the Charity Commission were educational, and to make provision for the transfer of these powers to the Board of Education.

b) As indicated above, no political guidance, either through the Lord President's directives, or through the provisions of the Board of Education Act, was given to the Committee to aid its deliberations.

c) The Charity Commission, through its representative, was anxious to delay the transfer of powers, and bent all its efforts in Committee to achieve this end.

d) Kekewich, as noted, did not have the Charity Commission, nor the Board of Agriculture, in his main sights when operating within the Committee. He was content at this stage that markers be put down for the eventual takeover of their educational functions, but he did not wish to press the point

further. There were more immediate and important questions for his consideration.

In consequence, the Charity Commission and the Board of Agriculture were 'touched with a light hand'. Devonshire, meanwhile, had made commitments with respect to the establishment of a Secondary Branch of the education service which were now rebounding on him. What the organisational response to this question was, and how it upset previous calculations of positional power in the bureaucratic system, is the subject of the next section of this chapter.

The Structure of the Board of Education

The Board of Education Act said nothing about the structure of the Board of Education. It was an enunciation of principle, not a detailed blueprint for reform of the central administrative apparatus. The form which the Board of Education was to take was the result of a complex mix of influences:

a) The impact of the various public or official utterances which both provided a framework for change and a constraint, by delineating the boundaries of the enquiry and by raising and sustaining public expectations. For example, the Bryce Report had this function, as did the terms of reference of the Walpole Committee, and Devonshire's initial commitment in the Lords to provide for a secondary education section in the new body.

b) The political influence of organisations outside the central administrative sphere. These included the county councils and the public schools, each of whose positional strengths would be affected by the precise form taken by the Board of Education.

c) Within the central administration itself, the power struggle which took place has already been partially described. It resulted in a victory for the Education Department and Kekewich relative to the S.A.D. and Abney, although, as has been noted, the latter was able to salvage a great deal from the situation. The Charity Commission and the Board of

Agriculture achieved their objective of delaying the transfer of their educational functions.

d) The passing of the 1902 Education Act, and the accession of Morant to the Secretaryship of the Department, promoted further significant change which took the matter into new ground.

The primary and immediate organisational question for resolution in 1899/1900 was that of the division of the proposed Board into sections dealing respectively with elementary, secondary and technical education. Whilst the question of the assimilation and subordination of the S.A.D. as a whole to the Education Department was not a matter for dispute, the precise form of the division certainly was. The main contention was over the respective positions of secondary and technical education. In this matter, as with other preceding questions which have been discussed, political input to the reorganisation process produced prior commitments which both tied the hands of those actually engaged in the search for a solution, yet imposed on these same people the task of making proposals which would be satisfactory to those to whom commitments had been made, as well as to others who would have an interest in the question. Just as with the matter of transference of Charity Commission and Board of Agriculture educational functions to the Board of Education, commitments were made in public before the full implications for implementation were acknowledged, or even addressed. With the Commission and the Board, as we have seen, the Walpole Committee could not, and to some extent would not, propose

an immediate solution to satisfy the terms of Devonshire's Act, as comes across transparently in their Third Report. However, the Duke's undertakings on Board of Education internal organisation to the supporters of traditional secondary education produced serious divisions of opinion amongst interested parties, and might well have led to unworkable compromise had those supporters not shown themselves willing to moderate their claims and allow Devonshire to extricate himself from the untenable position he had made for himself. The background to this may perhaps best be introduced in Devonshire's own words, as he introduced a Bill on secondary education to the House of Lords on June 26th 1900, shortly after the final meetings of the Walpole Committee. He referred firstly to Walpole's deliberations and to the carrying into effect of many of their recommendations. He noted:

> There was one point, however, which could not be relegated to any committee, however able. Your Lordships may remember that on the Bill of last year (*i.e. the Board of Education Bill*) some discussion took place upon the future organisation of the Education Department. I thought at the time, and am still more strongly of opinion now, that that discussion was somewhat premature. It proceeded on the assumption that the organisation of the new office would continue on the same lines as those which had existed when the educational Departments were separate and distinct, and that there would be in the new office two divisions, one of which would carry on the work of the old Education Office in connection with

elementary education, and the other of which would carry on the work of the Science and Art Department.[43]

This, in retrospect, seems to have been rather a naive understanding, it having been established that the whole thrust of the reforming machine was not simply in the direction of loss of independent existence for the S.A.D., which Devonshire's assumptions above would have supported, but also a systematic demolition of the type of educational provision it was promoting in opposition to the more traditional secondary education. There would have been no guarantee that this would have been achievable with the S.A.D. structure essentially intact within the new Board of Education. This was immediately recognised by the friends of secondary education, who lobbied Devonshire and Kekewich and elicited from the former an undertaking that a tripartite division of the Board would be established. They were apprehensive not only that the S.A.D. would continue its expansionary activities, but that the secondary schools (*i.e. the grammar schools*) would come under its administrative umbrella. Devonshire's undertaking led directly to the Minute to the Walpole Committee of November 11th 1899, which has been previously referred to.[44]

The floodgates had been opened to representations from outside Whitehall and Westminster by an equivocal speech which Devonshire had made to the Lords on May 2nd 1899, during the passage of the Board of Education Bill. He alluded to the departmental enquiry

which was to be set up, but would not commit himself on two questions of major importance:

> The Duke of Devonshire did not think it was possible for him to say very much upon the future of the Science and Art Department until the departmental enquiry had taken place...
>
> The question had, he believed, been discussed in educational circles whether the organisation of the department should be dual or should contain three divisions...Upon that point he should not like to express any decided opinion until the enquiry had been concluded.[45]

We shall return to July 1899, when a large input to the central deliberative apparatus was made with respect to the second question referred to above, but for the moment let us pursue Walpole in the light of Devonshire's comments about its intended future role in resolving these matters.

It has been shown that the Committee, under Kekewich's guidance, produced a Report which firmly and deliberately sought to subordinate the S.A.D. to the Education Department under his leadership. Clear, detailed reorganisation proposals reached the public sphere in the search for approval and mandate. Reorganisation proposals for the Education Department itself, although equally necessary and pressing, were not made public, the intention being to avoid tying bureaucratic hands from without.

This technique of organisational procedure, of opening to the public domain proposals for which support is sought, but burying those to which external input would be an undesirable interference, was used once again in this matter of the future division of the Board of Education.

In this, as in certain other questions, Walpole was effectively overruled in his interpretation of the terms of reference of the Committee. It will be remembered that he had expressed the opinion that the Committee was not to discuss the transfer of Charity Commission educational functions to the Board of Education, when Kekewich had previously declared a contrary opinion.[46] Kekewich's view, which reflected Devonshire's, prevailed. On the question of the division of the Board of Education, the positions on whether it was a matter for public recommendation were reversed, but again it was Kekewich who prevailed. Walpole had declared himself thus:

> The Chairman then said that he was anxious to learn the views of the Committee on the matter how far they should say in their Third Report what work should be done by the respective branches of the Board of Education, what branches there should be and who should do the work. He thought the Committee would be open to criticism if they said nothing about it in the Report, and he rather was of opinion that they would be expected to make a recommendation.[47]

Against this somewhat feeble assertion, Kekewich arrayed a battery of arguments designed to keep internal reorganisation of the Board of Education within the bureacracy, just as he had done previously when the internal structure of the Education Department (as opposed to the S.A.D.) had been under discussion:

> Sir George Kekewich said that this desire on the part of the public for the information referred to was wrong, and he thought it should not be given. In the first place, no-one knew what the administration of a public office means ... It would be inexpedient to make an arrangement for dividing up the work of the three branches, *for it is really vested with the responsible Minister and the Secretary*...It would be wrong for the Committee to make a recommendation as regards the nature of the work to be done by the respective branches when it might be found necessary to alter the whole thing. Besides, such a recommendation *would tie the hands of the Minister*, and the public would be able to point to the Report of the Committee laying down the methods on which the work should be provided for.[43]
>
> (my italics)

Abney, Tucker and Spring-Rice 'entirely agreed with Sir G.K.', the latter observing that 'the lines in the subject would be drawn later when the Education Office had some experience in the administration'. Fearon agreed that 'the whole matter was one of

office administration'. The Chairman caved in in the face of this bureaucratic solidarity, the Committee Secretary recording his statement that 'he gathered the feeling of the Committee to mean that there was no necessity to go into the question of the three branches'.[49]

And this was the end of it so far as the Committee was concerned. The Third Report's treatment of the subject testified to Walpole's lack of influence in the Committee which he chaired, and the triumph of those civil servants whose clear desire it was to retain the initiative in reorganisation and to react selectively with the environment to achieve this end:

> Your Grace will observe that in the remarks we have made, we have not attempted to lay down any rules as to the specific duties that should be entrusted to the several branches of the office. We have purposely abstained from doing so because we understand from the terms of our reference that it was not intended to impose this duty on us....We also doubt whether the time has yet come when any satisfactory or final decision can be arrived at on this question, or when any hard and fast rules can with advantage be laid down. The experience that will be gained as time goes on and as the work of the Board of Education develops will prove, we do not doubt, of the utmost value in dealing with this important administrative question, and a premature attempt to apportion with precision the work

> that should be dealt with by each of the branches would, we fear, only lead to confusion.[50]

Kekewich was clearly the leading figure in promoting this line of argument, as has been indicated. He had also been instrumental in promoting and carrying through the differential treatments of the S.A.D. and the Education Department, and of the Charity Commission and the Board of Agriculture. He must, therefore, be seen as the most influential figure by far on the Committee, and amongst the most important in this whole matter of departmental reorganisation. He was able to absorb environmental pressures and avoid a limiting check on his future powers as Secretary of the combined departments. Devonshire made public commitments on organisation, and then turned the matters over to the civil servants to come up with concrete proposals. Kekewich played a leading role in blunting these demands and shunting them off to an uncertain bureaucratic future through the medium of the published Reports of the Committee. He led a classic organisational response to external developments which held both possibilities and threats.

Analysis has been made of the Walpole Committee's role in defining, or rather *not* defining, the division of the new Board of Education.

To conclude this part of the work, mention will now be made of other developments in this area. To this end, we must return again to the summer of 1899.

Representations on this matter came both from outside bodies and individuals, and from within the central apparatus, both from politicians and civil servants. From without, Whitehall was bombarded with protests from the supporters of traditional secondary education during the period 7-11 July 1899, urging the establishment of a separate and distinct branch of the education service to deal with secondary education. Letters and telegrams from the Headmasters of Berkhamstead, Marlborough, Eton, King Edward's and Winchester were followed by the publication of resolutions from the Headmasters' Conference declaring that:

> ...an arrangement by which the three main factors of National Education (*i.e. primary, secondary and technical*) are thus placed on a separate, equal and independent footing is the best method of safeguarding the interests of all three, and of securing their satisfactory development in the future.[51]

What had promoted this furore had been the announcement a few days previously of the new appointments to be made to the education service on the retirement of Sir John Donnelly.[52] It had placed Kekewich in the Secretaryship of the S.A.D. as well as the Education Department, with Abney under him as Principal Assistant Secretary in charge of the S.A.D., and Tucker as Principal Assistant Secretary for the Education Department. This formula was interpreted as giving sanction to a bi-partite division to the new Board of Education in which the secondary schools would be under the jurisdiction of the S.A.D. Devonshire himself later agreed

this was a reasonable interpretation of the announcement, in the speech to the House of Lords of June 26th 1900, to which reference has been made above.[53] If so, this was a politically inept and badly thought out move to have made, and it brought down on Devonshire the wrath of interested parties who had seen, since Bryce, the apparently imminent decline and demise of the S.A.D. coming closer and closer, only now to have that desired objective snatched from them at the last moment. Not only that, but the secondary schools might now be about to come under its direct jurisdiction. The Duke's assumptions and proposals were not ideologically consistent with the weight of opinion and expectation which had built up, and the immediate and vociferous clamour which assailed him from without was proof of this. In fact, his ineptitude went further, because he agreed to meet the demands of the protesters (modifying the terms of reference of the Walpole Committee in November 1899) for a tripartite division, but then withdrew the commitment on June 26th 1900 by reverting to bipartite proposals. Admittedly, he was assisted in the latter by a modification of the views of the supporters of secondary education, who were prepared to accept the abolition of the name and position of the S.A.D. within a newly-constituted Secondary Branch and the appointment under the Principal Assistant Secretary for Secondary Education of an Assistant Secretary for literary studies (there would be a second Assistant Secretary for technological studies). This arrangement also satisfied the promoters of technical education, such as the City and Guilds of London Institute.[54]

We may see here how strangely out of touch Devonshire was in this essential question of the division of the new Board. His primary objective was to achieve the unity of the two departments, but he had clearly not considered early enough the implications of not making a firm commitment to destroy the continued independence of the S.A.D. *within* the Board of Education. Supporters of secondary education were not prepared to wait until Walpole came up with answers, which might possibly have proved unpalatable, but laid their position clearly before Devonshire and required him to modify his stance. The Committee, meanwhile, responded in an entirely different but predictable fashion to the demands made upon them. Instead of taking a political stance, they tried, with some success, to internalise the entire question of future Board of Education structure.

In addition to political, public, environmental input on this matter, and the contributions of the Walpole Committee, there was a third strand of expressed opinion. Like Walpole, it was internal and private, but unlike Walpole it was unconstrained by any public terms of reference. This undercurrent of communication, conducted between and amongst the politicians and civil servants in the education service, illustrates in a quite different fashion the preoccupations and manoeuvrings of interested parties, because undertaken within a distinct context whose ground rules and methods of operation were unlike either those of the public debate or those of the formal departmental committee. However, the personnel involved were to some extent the same as those whose behaviour has

been described in the other contexts. To this third forum of participation we turn now.

Michael Sadler, Director of the Office of Special Inquiries and Reports, and something of a peripheral figure in these deliberations, sent a memorandum to Devonshire on July 7th 1899 in which he pressed the claims of a tripartite division of the Board of Education. It is not coincidental that this was the same day on which the Education Department began to receive the stream of protests from the public schools following Devonshire's appointment memo of June 29th. Sadler wrote in an apparently even-handed manner of the dangers to either secondary or technical education if a person was appointed to head both whose expertise and experience had been predominantly in one:

> ...one of the two must suffer from the arrangement. If the Principal Assistant Secretary is mainly concerned in secondary schools, the technological side of education will lack the special help and interest which it would otherwise receive, and which it urgently needs in the interests of British trade and industry. If, on the other hand, the Principal Assistant Secretary for Higher Education were mainly experienced and interested in the work of technical education, secondary education would suffer through the official head of the branch not possessing real, first-hand and up-to-date knowledge of the very different needs and possibilities of secondary education existing in, or needed by, this country.[55]

He tried to disguise the real thrust of his argument by discussing his concern for technical education before that of secondary education in the above passage. However, it is clear that a concern about the appointment of Abney as Principal Assistant Secretary of the S.A.D. was the main motivation for Sadler's communication, as it was for the dissenting letters received from outside. He was able, a few days later, to voice his fears further when replying to Devonshire's request for a summary of the main duties which would devolve on a Secondary Education Department:

> It should added that, in all cases (as the Lord President has previously remarked) the most urgent function of the Secondary Education Department will be in the direction not of administrative coercion but of diplomatic negotiation, in order that reforms may come from within by consent *and not be roughly imposed by departmental order from without.* It is unquestionable that *the social forces which lie behind English secondary education of the best types are too strong to be dealt with in a summary, bureaucratic way.*[56] (my italics)

It might justifiably be said that Sadler was sacrificing objectivity for a certain emotional attachment to the ideals and standing of the traditional secondary school. It certainly appears that he overstated his case. However, this is not to imply that he wished an inferior provision on the technical side - simply a *separate* provision which would allow the secondary schools to

flourish away from the utilitarian influences of Abney and those associated with the S.A.D.[57]

In nailing his colours to the mast in this way, Sadler did not enhance his standing in the Department. On two later occasions, when the question of an appointment in connection with secondary education arose, he was passed over. The first time was just a fortnight after the memoranda referred to above, when the question arose of whom to appoint to the Walpole Committee with a knowledge of secondary education. Spring Rice wrote to Kekewich:

> If someone has to be added to our Committee to 'represent' Secondary Education, would not Fearon be a good choice? He is thoroughly sensible and practical...It would never do to have on a business committee some educational theorist or advocate of a doctrinaire idea.[58]

Sadler is not mentioned by name, but the allusion is clear. Note, incidentally, the bureaucrat's abhorrence of the non-bureaucrat, who may render discussions unpredictable and unbalanced, and therefore unmanageable.

The second instance concerned speculations on the appointment of a Head of a Secondary Department under Abney in the early part of 1900. Devonshire wrote to Kekewich:

I convey that I should not have...confidence in Mr Sadler whose educational zeal could probably land him into extreme counsels, but he would at least have the advantage of standing with the confidence of the schoolmasters, though not perhaps with the County Councils.[59]

Mention has been made in a previous chapter of the uneasy standing which a research unit such as Sadler's Office might have with the central bureaucratic organisation, because it would not conform to the latter's conception of how public policy might to be pursued. This point of view is reinforced by the analysis given above.[60]

The other principal actor in this drama, representing a viewpoint opposed to that of Sadler, was Abney. Before the inaugural meeting of the Walpole Committee, he was already fighting a rearguard action against, as he saw it, the forces of reaction who wished to undo the Science and Art Department's gains in the development of a 'modern' secondary education. In a memo to Kekewich on July 11th 1899, he criticised Sadler for seeking to stir up antagonisms, but made no concrete proposals for the organisation of the Board of Education.[61] In hindsight, it was sensible for Abney not to lay all his cards on the table before going into the Committee and being able to judge the mood of the others, particularly Kekewich. In fact, as we have seen, he came through the meetings concerning the reorganisation of the S.A.D. and the Education Department (*the Second Report*) without having made major concessions, and by February 1900, during those meetings of the Committee devoted to

the transfer of Charity Commission powers and Devonshire's undertaking to set up a third branch of the Board of Education, he was sufficiently confident to approach Kekewich directly, outside the context of the Committee, with his proposals for reorganisation.

In a letter of February 26th 1900, he reminded Kekewich of the central role that the S.A.D. had played in fostering a science-based secondary education as an alternative to the more traditional literary type, and deplored the fact that the tripartite division then supported by Devonshire would place science in the secondary branch of the Board under an appointee whose background was non-scientific:

> In other words modern secondary education is to be made subordinate to literary and classical education with the natural result that it would wither or become practically extinct.[62]

His concern throughout in this letter was that 'modern secondary education' should find a distinct place in the structure of the Board under a sympathetic and knowledgeable administrator. This is consistent with his stance in the Second Report meetings, in which he managed to retain intact the essential higher administrative structure of the S.A.D. In fact, having achieved the latter, the next step, logically, was to ensure that it had access to the environment through a head who would not stifle its aspirations.

Abney recognised that simply preserving the original S.A.D. group within the Board was insufficient. It had to be able to act - hence his desire to ensure that it found a safe haven sufficiently removed from predators. It must be assumed that Abney saw himself at the head of whichever branch oversaw scientific education - indeed, the assumption was so obvious that he felt obliged, at various points in the letter, to make disclaimers concerning his own existing, and possible future, role.

By March 1900 Abney was able to write directly to Devonshire, in response to a request from the latter for suggestions as to reorganisation, outside the context of the Walpole Committee meetings in which he was restricted, as all members were, by Devonshire's public commitment to a tripartite system. By this time, the supporters of traditional secondary education had somewhat modified their views, allowing Abney (but not the Committee) to propose to Devonshire a modified bipartite division for primary and secondary education, respectively, the latter to have two Principal Assistant Secretaries, one for literary education and the other for science, technology and art. They would be served by three Assistant Secretaries, for Arts (*i.e. literary studies*), for Science (including technology) and for Art. Abney's intentions here are clear. He was sufficiently aware of the opprobrium attaching to the name of the S.A.D.:

I have always been in favour of the Science and Art Department's title being sunk in favour of a name more suitable for the new Board. The title 'Science and Art Department' has been so connected with agitations from without that it might well be abolished *whilst the objects for which it was founded would still remain.*[63] (my italics)

He wished to deflect and subdue continued environmental pressures by modifying the public form and appearance of the S.A.D. whilst maintaining its substance and influence. The key to understanding the latter is in Abney's proposed disposition of staff and responsibilities:

> Nos. 2 and 3 Assistant Secretaries' divisions (those for the Science Division and for Art) are (or will be on 1st April) properly staffed with inspectors and with administrative staff...The evening classes and polytechnics would be in charge of No. 2 Assistant Secretary. All secondary education and the grants would thus be in one branch and would all come under one supervision. There is such an intimate connection between the science taught in classes and schools that it would be highly inconvenient and most probably detrimental to the instruction...if the two were separated.[64]

In other words, one Principal Assistant Secretary in the Secondary Branch, with No. 2 Assistant Secretary, would maintain the traditions and grant-giving powers of the S.A.D.

For once, Abney met an obstacle. Devonshire, by no means as wholly out of touch as he is often painted by detractors, recognised the thrust of Abney's proposals and, in doing so, rejected them, in a letter to Kekewich:

> I cannot think his proposals at all satisfactory. While nominally abandoning the title of Science and Art he leaves that Branch of the Department practically where it is but under two co-ordinate heads instead of one.[48]

The 'two co-ordinate heads', perhaps, misses the point, but the conception of Abney's strategy does not. However, Devonshire faced a dilemma. He wished to blunt the influence of the S.A.D. and its successor, but could not afford to shunt Abney, who now carried the mantle of S.A.D. orthodoxy in succession to Donnelly, into an administrative backwater. For this reason, Devonshire rejected, in the same letter to Kekewich, a tripartite proposal made to him by Gorst, on the grounds that:

> ...the objection to it as a present working arrangement is that it would dispossess Abney from some of his present functions from which he would probably not be well spared. He would of course have to be Principal Assistant Secretary for the Secondary Branch...

He continued:

> It seems to me that while aiming at some such arrangements (*i.e. Gorst's proposals*) as the final and permanent one, we might make the necessity of retaining Abney's experience over the whole range of his present work a reason for adopting a temporary arrangement somewhat on the lines of the enclosed rough sketch.[66]

He appended a diagram showing a bipartite arrangement of Elementary and Secondary branches, the latter headed by Abney as Principal Assistant Secretary with three Assistant Secretaries. By May, this had been reduced to two Assistant Secretaries, for Literary and Technological education respectively, and Kekewich on May 28th sought approval from the Treasury for these appointments.[67] Devonshire himself took the matter to the Cabinet at the end of May, and on June 26th he made the proposals public in introducing the Secondary Education Bill in the House of Lords.

Devonshire's memorandum to the Cabinet summarised the difficulties faced in attempting to blunt the influence of the S.A.D. on the pattern of secondary education. As has been stressed throughout this work, the problems were primarily organisational in nature, in that bureaucratic institutions resisted attempts from outside to remodel them, abolish them, or to change their purposes or methods of operation. This applied as much to the Education Department, which stood to gain from the new arrangements, as to the S.A.D.,

the Charity Commission and the Board of Agriculture which, in their different ways, stood to lose.

Whatever new form the Board took, it was inescapable that many schools, primarily the 'Schools of Science', would remain closely wedded to the S.A.D., even if the name of that body should disappear:

> ...in the schools and institutions directly assisted by the Department, science and art instruction, with the addition perhaps of some subjects of a commercial nature, must remain the main object...The relations between these schools and the scientific experts of the Science and Art Department cannot be broken off, and they must remain practically under the administration of the same men, though perhaps under a somewhat different organisation.[68]

This encapsulates the point. Abney had to remain, as did the bulk of the administrators who had been associated with him in the S.A.D. Public policy-making organisations which have enjoyed a measure of independence and financial power create needs and loyalties which cannot be changed easily or immediately. Formal organisational change does not guarantee a new start - both within the 'new' body, and in the body's environment, legacies of the old order persist. Devonshire failed adequately to appreciate this point in his comments to the Cabinet:

The apprehension, reasonable or unreasonable, was, I think, that the tendency of the Board would be, in the first place, to substitute science for classics and literature, and, next, to regard science only from the point of view of its commercial value. It is probably true that any interference by the Science and Art Department with Secondary Education will be in the first of these directions. But it ought not to be difficult to find administrators with sufficiently wide knowledge and experience to make the latter impossible.[69]

Moving public organisations, personnel and processes away from a familiar and long-established pattern may be a task of much difficulty and complexity. It has been shown in this study that its achievement requires *political*, quite as much as *technical*, skills and, most importantly, the ability to take the initiative and impose the direction of change without being, subtly or unsubtly, manoeuvred into an acquiescence of some variation of the status quo ante.

REFERENCES

In the following notes, PRO refers to material in the Public Record Office, Kew.

1. For biographical notes on the composition of the Committee, see reference 70 below.
2. see Chapter 3, pp. 201-5.
3. ibid., p. 180
4. PRO ED 24/62, Devonshire as Lord President of the Council established Walpole Committee, 4/7/99.
5. PRO ED 24/61. From a confidential, unsigned, undated memo on secondary education, headed 'Based on conversation with GWK (*Kekewich*) Jan 10 189(9?)'.
6. PRO ED 24/61. Kekewich to Devonshire (as Lord President) 8/6/99.
7. PRO ED 24/62. *Second Report of the Committee on the Reorganisation of the Education Department and the Science and Art Department* 12/1/00
8. PRO ED 24/62. Documents of 7/7/99 and 11/99.
9. op.cit. 7/7/99.
10. PRO ED 24/62. *Second Report*, p. 9, Section 23.
11. see page 274 and afterwards.
12. PRO ED 24/62. A draft Minute was prepared by Kekewich to enlarge the terms of reference of the Committee, and its membership with the addition of D R Fearon, Secretary to the Charity Commission. Minute approved by Devonshire and dated 4/11/99.

13. The origins of this question are found in July 1899.

See p. 259.

14. PRO ED 24/62. *Second Report*, p. 14, Section 42.

15. op.cit., p. 16, Section 47.

16. PRO ED 24/60. *Report of the Departmental Committee upon the existing accommodation and the probable requirements of the department in new buildings.* 1896.

17. PRO ED 24/62. *Second Report*, p. 16, Section 47.

18. PRO ED 24/65. *Report of the Departmental Committee upon the Reorganisation of the Clerical Staff.* 26/7/99.

19. op.cit.

20. op.cit.

21. PRO ED 24/62. *Meetings of Committee - Notes for Chairman's use and for Reports.*

22. op.cit. - Meeting of 13/12/99.

23. PRO ED 24/62. *Second Report*, p. 7, Section 13.

24. PRO ED 24/8. *Board of Education Act*, 1899, Section 2, Clause 1.

25. op.cit. Section 2, Clause 2.

26. PRO ED 24/62. *Third Report of the Committee on the Reorganisation of the Education Department and the Science and Art Department* 14/3/00

27. PRO ED 24/8. 15/7/98.

28. PRO ED 24/8. *Draft of a Bill to provide the appointment of a Minister of Education for England and Wales, and for matters connected therewith.* Section 2.

29. PRO ED 24/8. *A Bill entitled 'An Act to provide for the establishment of a Board of Education for England and Wales, and for matters connected therewith'.*

30. PRO ED 24/8. Victoria University Conference on Secondary Education, December 3rd 1898. Resolution 4.

31. PRO ED 24/8. Kekewich to Devonshire, 11/12/98.

32. Section 2, Clause 2 of the *Act*.

33. p. 247.

34. PRO ED 24/62. Walpole Committee Meeting of 24/11/99.

35. PRO ED 24/62. *Third Report*, p. 6, Section 7.

36. PRO ED 24/62. Walpole Committee Meeting of 9/3/00.

37. Statistics provided for the Walpole Committee Meeting of 12/1/00 by D R Fearon. See PRO ED 24/62.

38. PRO ED 24/62. Minute to Committee from Devonshire, 28/2/00.

39. see p. 170.

40. The Bryce hearings provide ample evidence of this. See p. 92.

41. see p. 249.

42. PRO ED 24/62. *Third Report*, p. 1, Section 3.

43. House of Lords, 26/6/00. Reported in *The Times* of 27/6/00.

44. See note 12 above.

45. PRO ED 24/64. Departmental extract of Devonshire's speech to the House of Lords on 2/5/99 on the subject of the Board of Education Bill.

46. p. 256.

47. PRO ED 24/62. Walpole Committee Meeting of 16/2/00.

48. ibid.

49. ibid.

50. PRO ED 24/62. *Third Report*, p. 8, Section 18.

51. PRO ED 24/64. *Resolution with respect to the new Board of Education, passed by the Committee of the Conference, July 11th 1899.*

52. PRO ED 24/62. Minute from Devonshire on appointments 'to take effect upon the retirement of Major General Sir J.F.D. Donnelly. K.C.B...' 29/6/99.

53. see note 43 above.

54. Sir P. Magnus of the City and Guilds Institute had asked, in December 1899, to be heard by the Walpole Committee on the subject of instruction in technological subjects, but had been told that it was not taking evidence from outsiders. Nevertheless, there is confirmation from Devonshire's correspondences that its views, which related to the desirable division of the Board of Education, were taken into account.

55. PRO ED 24/64. Sadler to Devonshire.

56. PRO ED 24/64. *Memorandum on the duties which would have to be entrusted to the Secondary Education Department of the Board of Education.* Sadler to Devonshire, 11/7/99.

57. Sadler's earlier writings (see p. 99) supported a greater integration of technical and 'general' education, and such a stance would seem to be contradicted somewhat by his vehement denouncement here of the possible appointment over secondary schools of a technically-qualified Principal Assistant Secretary. The key, it appears, lies in Sadler's advocacy of 'balance' in educational provision, if a consistency of view is to be assumed.

58. PRO ED 24/62. Spring Rice to Kekewich, 25/7/99.

59. PRO ED 24/64. Devonshire to Kekewich, 25/1/00.

60. see pp. 153-4.

61. PRO ED 24/64. Abney to Kekewich, 11/7/99.

62. PRO ED 24/64. Abney to Kekewich, 26/2/00.

63. PRO ED 24/64. Abney to Devonshire, 3/00.

64. ibid.

65. PRO ED 24/64. Devonshire to Kekewich, 15/3/00.

66. ibid.

67. PRO ED 24/64. Kekewich to the Secretary, Treasury, 28/5/00.

68. PRO ED 24/64. Memo from Devonshire to Cabinet, 31/5/00.

69. ibid.

70. Walpole Committee - biographical notes:

Horatio Walpole (1843-1923). A civil servant of moderate distinction. He was Assistant Under-Secretary at the India Office from 1883 to 1907.

George W. Kekewich (1841-1921). The dominant figure on the Walpole Committee, he spent his entire career as a civil servant within the Education Department and its successor. He was appointed Examiner 1867, Senior Examiner 1871, and was Secretary from 1890 to 1900. The Duke of Devonshire appointed him first Secretary of the Board of Education, a post he retained until 1903, when he was succeeded by Morant. He later reverted to family type and ran successfully as a Liberal candidate for Parliament, holding his seat from 1906 to 1910.

William de W. Abney (1843-1921). Like his superior in the Science and Art Department, Sir John Donnelly, Abney was a soldier by profession, joining the Royal Engineers in 1861. He moved across to the education service, becoming Inspector of Science Schools in 1873, Assistant Director of Science in 1884, and Director of Science in 1893. He achieved the Presidencies of the Royal Astronomical Society (1893-95) and the Physical Society (1895-97), and became Chairman of the Society of Arts in 1904. He was appointed Principal Assistant Secretary of the Board of Education in 1899, and held the post until 1903. More than anyone, he represented the continuation of the S.A.D. tradition.

Daniel R. Fearon (1835-1919). A civil servant whose experiences spanned both the education service and the administration of charitable trusts. He was appointed H.M.I. in 1860, and became an Assistant Commissioner on both the Schools Enquiry Commission and the Endowed Schools Commission. He became Assistant Charity Commissioner in 1874, was Secretary of the Charity Commission from 1886 to 1900, and held the post of Charity Commissioner from 1900 to 1903. He was anxious to safeguard the integrity of the Commission's work from precipitate assimilation by the Board of Education.

Stephen E Spring Rice (1856-1902). Like Kekewich, a one-department civil servant. At the time of appointment to the Committee, he was Principal Clerk at the Treasury. He entered this department in 1878, serving various Financial Secretaries as Private Secretary from 1881 to 1888, and the Chancellor in the same capacity in 1886. Financial control of public spending by the Treasury was more

immediate and detailed in the late 19th century than is the case today, and Spring Rice represented an interest whose agreement would be required for changes involving public expenditure.

William Tucker (? -1909). A two-department civil servant. After a spell in the Exchequer and Audit Department (1853-69), he joined the Education Department, rising to Principal Assistant Secretary with Abney. Tucker may be considered as Kekewich's main source of support on the Walpole Committee.

(these biographical and other notes were taken from the Dictionary of National Biography and 'Who was Who' - various editions)

Conclusions

This study has attempted to describe and explain a familiar set of events, the circumstances surrounding the reorganisation of the education system in England and Wales at the end of the nineteenth century, in a novel and more complete manner, by utilising the tools of organisational theory to analyse the processes and motivations of change. I would submit that such an approach, together with more conventional methods of historical research, is imperative where matters of public policy-making are concerned, precisely because the institutional dimension may be such an influential factor in its own right in the determination of change.

This is never more obviously the case as here, where a classically bureaucratic structure of a government department interacted with politicians, whose values were quite distinct, and with other departments which shared a common, basic set of organisational values (though not output values) with it. However, if the matter in question were purely one of organisational reconstruction, it might be solely of interest to theorists of this field. But it is not, because, as has been emphasised, government departments are purposive bodies which pursue goals in the public service, and therefore the pattern of reorganisation will inevitably affect (and be affected by) their perception of their role. Since this role extends to the formulation and implementation of policy, departments being uniquely placed, in contrast to politicians, both to take a longer view and to control the apparatus of

administration, reorganisation will have a bearing on the direction of national policy.

Hypotheses were made at the beginning of this study. It is proposed to comment on them in the light of findings:

a) *An understanding of national educational change depends both on description of events, participants and processes, and categorisation of the relationships between those involved in the change.*

Deliberately, exactly who *those* might be had not, at that stage, been specified. As indicated above, understanding of institutional relationships has proved essential. The role of individuals and their relationships both with other individuals, and with institutions, is more problematic. It is difficult to see them except as representatives of a class, and therefore often of a sponsoring organisation, so their behaviour usually cannot be treated in isolation as peculiarly *their* behaviour. Kekewich was a dominant personality in this story, but his strength lay in his positional power as departmental head, his links with the schoolmasters, and his Liberal associations. Abney's position was entirely tied up with the S.A.D. and various scientific bodies. Devonshire's contribution, at turns participatory and 'hands off', highlights the problems (and opportunities for other players) which may arise when the nominal institutional leader plays his role inconsistently and, at times, weakly. Sadler provides an

intriguing example of a person *in* an organisation, but not *of* it, but his championship of the grammar schools and literary education in the debate on the structure of the Board of Education does not allow us to present him as a disinterested spectator.

We should not ignore the personal qualities of the individual participants, but in each case they are qualities the exercise of which has an institutional context. In the policy debate, they have efficacy only in this context. It is the combination of personal and positional powers which is important in discussing the contribution of an individual to policy debate.

b) *The determination of educational change follows from the impact of environmental influences on organisations, and the interaction of organisations. It should be possible to generalise about the relative importance of these factors in given situations.*

That these two factors were both present in the case in question cannot be disputed. A climate of approval existed for a reorganisation of the education service at the end of the nineteenth century. Its predominant elements were support for rationalisation and a desire to trim back the influences of the Science and Art Department. This basic pattern of informed opinion provided a sound ideological prop to support change, and it is in this context that the reconstruction debate took place. It has been suggested that the presence of such a support is essential if

major change is to succeed. The government of the mid-1980's is similarly faced with growing demands for improvements to the education service, but it remains to be seen whether it has the political acumen to turn such a development to its advantage. The evidence of the 1890's is that it will take notice of the growing swell of opinion, but the realisation of the need for change, and its accomplishment, are different matters. Thus, although, in a representative democracy, informed and popular opinion may demand change of its representatives, it remains the case that the politicians can only effect such change through the planning and consultative process which is pre-eminently the province of the departments.

The hypothesis makes a distinction between the environment of an involved organisation, and its relationships with other organisations. To some extent, the study has shown this distinction to be a false one, since the environment of a department consists not simply of the general social and political world around it, but also, most importantly, of other organisations, so that relationships with these organisations are themselves interaction with the department's environment. One might characterise popular opinion as external to all participating institutions, but informed opinion, such as that which came out in the Bryce hearings, is almost always group-based, and it is the latter which most often sways governments in a particular direction.

To talk of environmental influences and organisational interaction as distinct phenomena is, therefore, not fruitful, if one includes in the former inter-institution relations. However, it is useful to state that a prerequisite for successful educational change of a national nature is a supportive ideology, itself an environmental factor. It was taken as a datum by the dominant participants in this study that, whatever the final structure of the new education service, certain elements of the old system would disappear. Hence the furore which arose when Devonshire inadvertently gave the impression that the S.A.D. would live on in the new structure, and even dominate literary education. It was an unanticipated turn of events which shocked because it apparently overturned the environmental consensus which had become accepted and internalised. Even Abney, it will be remembered, paid lip service to this tide of opinion, opposing it with subtlety from within the administration, rather than in public.

The success of a major reform proposal which does not have environmental backing must be considered problematic in an open society, not least because centrally sponsored proposals would have no solid basis of external support to inform and to give structure to them. Political institutions, and I would include government departments in this category, do not function effectively in a vacuum of unreality.

To return to the hypothesis, it might be modified to say that the presence (or absence) of general environmental support is always

crucial to the success or failure of centrally-sponsored change, and that, therefore, the climate of public opinion (informed and popular) should form the first object of research in a study of this kind, as was done with the analysis of the Bryce Commission's work. Only then can one fruitfully consider how change proposals are produced in the central political/administrative arena.

c) *In the education field, because of the nature of the participants, the ability of one organisation to have its views prevail over another is a function of:*

1) the degree of congruency of formal and informal structures within the bodies concerned;

2) the type and degree of authority wielded;

3) the quality of communications between the bodies.

Under these three sub-headings, the intention was to discuss the relationships of mutual influence between the politicians, public administrative bodies, and bodies external to central government. In many ways, this was the most difficult task, because of their multi-faceted, often clandestine, nature.

Under 1) the effect of unity (or disunity) of an organisation's official, publicly-stated aims with its internal, unofficial aims on its ability to dominate other organisations, was to be tested. It was suggested that an organisation would be likely to have greater success in having its views prevail if it presented a

clear, strong and consistent front to the environment which was backed with vigour by members of the organisation internally. There is some evidence in this study to support this, but it has proved simplistic to suggest that the factor can be isolated from that of 2) and 3). Taking all three factors together, it would be fair to hypothesise that a body united in itself, wielding authority, and with adequate means of scrutiny and investigation, would prevail in its views over another body not so endowed. But objects of research do not tend to come so neatly packaged, so it is necessary to investigate the *balance* of factors as they are presented in each case.

The relationship between the politicians and the public bodies is a case in point. The involved politicians, represented here primarily by Devonshire and Gorst, were too fragmented to form an organisation as such, and they therefore lacked the structural strength which characterised the departments. They did not exhibit a strong, united, consistent approach to the question of reorganisation. Several instances have been given of ineptitude, vacillation, and abnegation of responsibility. Their ability to monitor the workings of the government machinery (the deliberations of the Walpole Committee, for example) must be called into question. They faced four bodies (the Education Department, the S.A.D., the Charity Commission and the Board of Agriculture) which mobilised bureaucratic strengths, in different ways, to their own advantages. In this study, they gave a degree of latitude to the civil servants to produce reorganisation proposals which might not

have been given in different circumstances with different players. The Walpole Committee, for example, was set up as an *official* committee, when in other circumstances it might have been chaired by the responsible politician, in this case Gorst, with arguably different outcomes (there was no love lost between Gorst and Kekewich). The politicians produced no clear plans at the outset on the assimilation of the educational functions of the Charity Commission and the Board of Agriculture, nor on the future structure of the Board of Education. The core question of the amalgamation of the S.A.D. with the Education Department was left entirely to the civil service. It is demonstrable that the initiative in all these cases passed from the politicians, either by design or by default. Most importantly, their ability to monitor the activities of the civil servants (the *quality of communications* of the third hypothesis) was quite inadequate. They relied on the civil servants to let them know what was happening and to give them advice. To what extent advice becomes policy-making is a perpetual question in discussion of the politician/civil servant relationship. Yet, despite their weaknesses, the politicians had an essential *constitutional* authority which made their position tenable, if not dominant. The bureaucrats were very successful in influencing the structure and pace of the change, but the politicians, themselves influenced by external pressure groups, were able still, to dictate the ground rules for reorganisation, through devices such as statute, Minutes, Orders in Council, and the convention of ministerial responsibility.

When considering the relationships between the public bodies themselves, one is struck by the shared set of values which they exhibited in their deliberations. They talked to each other, and they understood the rules of the reorganisation game which dictated that political authority would, with greater or lesser clarity, lay out the rules under which they would conduct discussion, but that then they would have scope to promote their own interests. It was accepted, amongst themselves, that they would do so. But the authority which each brought to the discussion was different, and understood clearly in a system characterised by hierarchy. Appointed Secretary of the proposed Board of Education, Kekewich dominated. It is noticeable how subordinate a role Walpole played in a committee which he nominally chaired. Quite simply, his organisational base had no stake in the outcome of the discussions, and he was personally unable to overcome the positional deficiencies of his role. Abney was in a curious position, but one not without possibilities, as we have seen. While subordinated to Kekewich by Devonshire's Minute, and representing an organisation the diminution of whose influence had received political sanction, he managed nevertheless to play a leading role in committee and have accepted his plans for reorganisation of the S.A.D. clerical and higher administrative grades. He faced difficulties only when Devonshire rejected his proposal to perpetuate the S.A.D. under another guise within the Board of Education itself. He wielded an authority which was based on indispensability. He understood the S.A.D. and its activities, and was prepared to trade the Secretaryship of a body whose days were numbered for a position of

power within the new structure. Kekewich needed his expertise and co-operation in restructuring the education service, and was prepared to give him latitude in doing so.

There are certain methodological pointers in this study which would help in similar research on centrally-sponsored change.

1) There may, or may not, be a set of general environmental data which both politicians and public bodies will take as a touchstone. Ascertaining whether or not there is a general consensus to which politicians and civil servants feel themselves accountable for action would be a fruitful first step. To the extent that it exists, a point of reference is established by which action may be judged. It will act as a constraint on behaviour, a limiting device which will make success more likely if actions are compatible with it, but will make failure probable if public expectations are not satisfied. If no such backing can be found in society at large, then one is dealing with a more narrowly-based enterprise whose success is more problematic. Moreover, one has lost the external reference point which is so valuable.

2) There are several sets of relationships which bear on the outcome of change proposals:

   a) pressure groups on politicians, and vice versa;

   b) pressure groups on departments, and vice versa;

   c) politicians on departments, and vice versa;

   d) departments on departments, or other public bodies.

These relationships are not of the same nature in each case, and so it is important to approach them differently:

   a) politicians have a constitutional duty of responsiveness and accountability to environmental groups, so the initiative may not be theirs in this relationship;

   b) the relationship of pressure groups to departments is constitutionally no more than an extension of their dealings with the politicians, but in practice departments, lacking a public accountability, may have far greater scope for blunting the demands of external groups than politicians have;

   c) this is the KEY relationship, because it covers the axis of policy-making. It is essential to ascertain the pattern of communications between these two groups. Are the politicians clear in their intentions and fully in command of the scope of the enquiry, or have they remitted it to the bureaucracy for solution?;

d) this assumes a greater importance if the politician/civil service link is weaker, on the principle that the departments will take steps to impose their own views on a question if there is a poor degree of political involvement.

This study has sought to demonstrate that the pursuit of national educational change in a mature society is pre-eminently a study of institutional interaction. Individuals as *practitioners*, as opposed to *theorists*, are successful only to the extent that they can utilise the authority of the position they hold within the organisation or group to which they belong. To return to a point made at the outset, educational change is always and everywhere *political* change, and cannot be understood outside the context of a research methodology which does not recognise the realities of organisational power.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Primary sources

Report of the Schools Inquiry Commission (*the Taunton Report*), 1868.

Report of the Royal Commission on Secondary Education (*The Bryce Report*) 1895:

Volume 1: Part 1: Historical Sketch;

Part 2: The Present Condition of Secondary Education in England;

Part 3: Review of Evidence, with Discussion of Suggestions made by Certain Witnesses.

Volume 2: Minutes of Evidence.

Volume 3: Minutes of Evidence.

Volume 4: Minutes of Evidence.

Volume 5: Commissioners' Reports.

The Public Record Office ED 24 files were used extensively. The main sources are listed below with, where appropriate, details of those documents of particular importance:

PRO ED 24/8.

Draft of a Bill to provide the appointment of a Minister of Education for England and Wales, and for matters connected therewith.

A Bill entitled 'An Act to provide for the establishment of a Board of Education for England and Wales, and for matters connected therewith'.

Victoria University Conference on Secondary Education, December 3rd 1898.

PRO ED 24/60.

Report of the Departmental Committee upon the existing accommodation and the probable requirements of the department in new buildings. 1896.

PRO ED 24/61.

PRO ED 24/62.

Minute from Devonshire on appointments 'to take effect upon the retirement of Major General Sir J.F.D. Donnelly. K.C.B...' 29/6/99.

Meetings of Committee - Notes for Chairman's use and for Reports.

Second Report of the Committee on the Reorganisation of the Education Department and the Science and Art Department 12/1/00.

Third Report of the Committee on the Reorganisation of the Education Department and the Science and Art Department 14/3/00.

PRO ED 24/64.

Departmental extract of Devonshire's speech to the House of Lords on 2/5/99 on the subject of the Board of Education Bill.

Resolution with respect to the new Board of Education, passed by the Committee of the Conference, July 11th 1899.

Memorandum on the duties which would have to be entrusted to the Secondary Education Department of the Board of Education. Sadler to Devonshire, 11/7/99.

PRO ED 24/65.

Report of the Departmental Committee upon the Reorganisation of the Clerical Staff. 26/7/99.

2. Historical background

Banks, O.L., *Parity and Prestige in English Secondary Education*, RKP 1955.

Bishop, A.S., *The Rise of a Central Authority for English Education*, Oxford University Press 1971.

Board of Education, *Reports 1902-7.*

Butterworth, H., *The Science and Art Department 1853-1900*, Ph.D. Thesis Sheffield University.

Eaglesham, E.R., 'Planning the Education Bill of 1902', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, Vol 9 1960-1.

Eaglesham, E.R., 'Implementing the Education Act of 1902', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, May 1961.

Eaglesham, E.R., *The Foundations of 20th century Education in England*, RKP 1972.

Gosden, P.H.J.H., *The development of educational administration in England and Wales*, Blackwell 1966.

Gosden, P.H.J.H., 'The Board of Education Act 1899', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, November 1962.

Grier, L., *Achievement in Education - the Work of Michael Ernest Sadler 1885-1935*, Constable 1952.

Higginson, J.H., *'Selections from Michael Sadler'*, *Studies in World Citizenship*, Dejall and Meyer 1979.

Higginson, J.H., 'Sir Michael Sadler - a Centenary Brochure', *Yorkshire Post*, June 1961.

Kazamias, A.M., *Politics, Society and Secondary Education in England*, University of Pennsylvania Press 1966.

Kekewich, G.W., *The Education Department and After*, Constable 1920.

Lilley, R.C., 'Attempts to implement the Bryce Commission's Recommendations - and the Consequences', *History of Education*, 1982, Vol. 11, No. 2.

Lowndes, G.A.N., *The Silent Social Revolution - an Account of the Expansion of Public Education in England and Wales 1895-1965*, Oxford University Press 1969.

Mackay, R.F., *Balfour - Intellectual Statesman*, Oxford University Press 1985.

Mackinder, J.H., Sadler, M.E., *University Extension, past, present and future*, Cassell 1893.

Maclure, J. Stuart (ed.), *Educational Documents*, Methuen 1974.

Musgrave, P.W., 'The Definition of Technical Education 1860-1910', *Sociology, History and Education*, Methuen 1970.

Peterson, A.D.C., *A Hundred Years of Education*, Duckworth 1971.

Pugh, M., *The Making of Modern British Politics 1867-1939*, Blackwell 1982.

Sadleir, M., *Sir Michael Sadler: a Memoir by his Son*, Constable 1949.

Sutherland, G., *Policy-making in Elementary Education 1870-95*, Oxford University Press 1973.

The Times: March 2nd 1894; March 7th 1894; November 1st 1895.

3. Organisation Theory

Bennis, W.G., Benne, K.D., Chin, R., 'Change Strategies', *The Planning of Change*, Holt, Rinehart, Winston 1970.

Blau, P., Scott, W., *Formal Organisations - a Comparative Approach*, RKP 1963.

Cooke, A.B., Vincent J., *The Governing Passion*, Harvester 1974.

Dale, R., 'Phenomenological Perspectives and the Sociology of the School'; in Meighan, R., (ed.), *Sociology and Teaching*, Educational Review Vol. 25, No. 3, June 1973.

Davis, B., 'On the Contribution of Organisational Analysis to the Study of Educational Institutions', *Knowledge, Education and Cultural Change*, ed Brown, R., Tavistock 1973.

Finer, H., *The British Civil Service*, Fabian Society 1927.

Gouldner, A.W., 'Organisational Analysis', Merton, R.K., et al, *Sociology Today*, Basic Books 1959.

Gulick, L., and Urwick, L.F., *Papers on the Science of Administration*, New York 1937.

Hall, P., Land, H., Parker, R., Webb, A., *Change. Choice and Conflict in Social Policy*, HEB 1978.

Hall, R.H., *Organisations: Structure and Processes*, Prentice-Hall 1974.

Hoyle, E., 'Organisational Analysis in the Field of Education', *Educational Research*, Vol. 7 No. 2, 1964-5.

Hoyle, E., 'Planned Organisational Change in Education', *Research in Education*, Vol. 3, May 1970.

Katz, D., Kahn, R., *The Social Psychology of Organisations*, 2nd Edition, Wiley 1978.

Kelsall, R.K., 'Higher Civil Service Recruitment', *History, Sociology and Education*, History of Education Society, Methuen 1971.

Millett, John, *Organisation for the Public Service*, New York 1966.

Musgrave, P.W., 'A Model for the analysis of the development of the English educational system from 1860', *Sociology, History and Education*, Methuen 1970.

Paulston, R.G., *Conflicting Theories of Social and Educational Change*, University of Pittsburgh 1976.

Perrow, Charles, *Organisational Analysis - A Sociological View*, Tavistock 1974.

Pitt, D.C., and Smith, B.C., *Government Departments: an Organisational Perspective*, RKP 1981.

Pugh, D.S., *Organisation Theory*, Penguin 1984.

Salter, Brian, and Tapper, Ted, *Education, Politics and the State*, Grant McIntyre 1981.

Self, Peter, *Administrative Theories and Politics*, GAU 1982.

Thomas, Rosamund, *The British Philosophy of Administration*, Longmans 1978.

Warren, D.I., *Visibility and Conformity in Formal Organisations*, American Sociological Review, Vol. 33 Dec. 1968.

Weber, Max, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organisations*, trans. Hendersons and Parsons, New York Press 1947.